Case 1	:14-cr-00399-ENV	Document 66!	Filed 10/20)/18	Page 1 of 243 PageID #: 5839	
					3005	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK					
2			X	11 0	200/EMIX)	
3	14-CR-399(ENV) UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, United States Courthouse					
4	Plai	intiff,			oklyn, New York	
5	-aga	ainst-			1 30, 2018 00 a.m.	
6	ABRAXAS J. DISCALA, ALSO KNOWS AS AJ DISCALA, AND KYLEEN CANE,					
7						
8	Defendants.					
9	TF	TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR TRIAL				
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ERIC N. VITALIANO UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE					
11			BEFORE A J			
12	APPEARANCES					
13	For the Govern	nment:			ATTORNEY'S OFFICE	
14			271 Cadman	n Pla		
15			BY: SHANN MARK	NON J	JONES	
16			PATRI	ICK H	IEIN	
17	Ear the Defens	Jonet.			ted States Attorneys	
18	For the Defend Abraxas J. Dis		111 Broadw	way	ASSOCIATES, LLC	
19					York 10008 ROSS, ESQ.	
20			ANDREW BOW 1804 Post			
21					necticut 06880	
22			HANWEI CHE	-		
23			15155 Gale Suite D Whittier			
24			willtler,	Call	fornia 90603	
25						

PROCEEDINGS

1 to the jury now.

1.3

However, one thing. I just wanted to flag for the Court, the government has prepared a letter, which we have to get supervisor approval for in the next few minutes, and as soon as we do, we will file it, which deals with four of the witnesses, and many of the exhibits that are offered by Mr. Discala.

Since we think our letter will crystalize those issues after we file it, we will ask that we argue it at a break before those witnesses are called because we believe that much of the evidence offered by the defendant should be precluded, either because it is irrelevant or because it calls for expert testimony for which there's been no notice.

MR. ROSS: Judge, we will certainly argue against that.

THE COURT: I would hope. But it will be a short argument if it's only one side.

MR. BOWMAN: And I should just note the reason for the government not filing already, is that the defense counsel essentially dumped a bunch of 3500 on us on Saturday and Sunday that was not previously produced.

MS. JONES: Your Honor, it's not just 3500 materials, the defendant produced on Saturday for the first time a 147-page analysis by its accountant witnesses that includes over a hundred schedules, and over 4,000 pages of

1 backup, and the first we got this was on Saturday evening. 2 MR. ROSS: And we can argue this at the break. I 3 don't want to take up time, but we've been doing everything 4 that we can to gather this material. The scope of the 5 prosecution's witness, Joan Mazella, was not known to us and 6 so we've done absolutely everything we can. This is a very, 7 very important witness to us. If the prosecution thinks that 8 the government thinks that they have a cross-examination to 9 expose the flaws in the analysis, then they can do that. 10 MR. RIOPELLE: And, Your Honor, Roland Riopelle. I 11 do have my last witness for Ms. Cane here, he's a very brief 12 witness. 1.3 You plan to take that witness after the THE COURT: 14 government rests? 15 MR. BOWMAN: Yes, he traveled from out of town. 16 THE COURT: That's fine. 17 Your Honor, at this point we only have MR. ROSS: three witnesses. We have three witnesses that will all be 18 19 ready to go today. 20 MR. BOWMAN: Who are the witnesses?

MR. ROSS: We've given you notice.

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BOWMAN: You told us four yesterday.

THE COURT: Somebody dropped out.

MR. ROSS: Someone dropped out.

So it's Mr. Parker, Mr. Engstrom and Ms. Eckert.

Case 1:14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 8 of 243 PageID #: 5846				
	VOULGARIS - DIRECT - BINI 3012			
1	and 56 seconds to eight minutes and 18 seconds in the same			
2	call.			
3	(Audio recording played.)			
4	Q Now, I ask you in the same call to listen to the clip			
5	from 10:29 to the conclusion of the call.			
6	(Audio recording played.)			
7	MR. BINI: Now I'd like to publish, Your Honor,			
8	198-42E from beginning of the call to four minutes and 33			
9	seconds.			
10	THE COURT: You may.			
11	MR. BINI: Before we do that, let me just ask the			
12	witness.			
13	Q Who are the participants of this call?			
14	A Kyleen Cane and Abraxas Discala.			
15	Q And what's the time of the call?			
16	A 12:33 p.m.			
17	MR. BINI: Okay, we can now listen to it.			
18	(Audio recording played.)			
19	MR. BINI: Your Honor, at this time if the			
20	government could publish 198-57, a voice mail call from			
21	June 2014.			
22	THE COURT: You may.			
23	(Audio recording played.)			
24	MR. BINI: Now if I could publish to the jury			
25	129-89, Your Honor, a text message in evidence.			

Case 1	14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 9 of 243 PageID #: 5847			
	VOULGARIS - DIRECT - BINI 3013			
1	THE COURT: Please proceed.			
2	(Exhibit published.)			
3	Q Agent Voulgaris, who are these messages between?			
4	A Kyleen Cane and Andy McAlpine.			
5	Q And what type of messages are they?			
6	A They're text messages.			
7	Q What are the date of these messages?			
8	A June 7th, 2014.			
9	Q What is the first message in the series?			
10	A That stock is creeping up.			
11	Q And what's the response to that?			
12	A You have a million shares; wasn't it?			
13	Q And what's the response to that?			
14	A First deposit will be 270,000, but there will be two			
15	more.			
16	Q What's the next response after that?			
17	A Okay, great.			
18	MR. BOWMAN: Your Honor, if the government could			
19	publish to the jury 198-51E, excerpt of a call from one minute			
20	31 seconds to one minute 49 seconds.			
21	THE COURT: You may.			
22	MR. BOWMAN: I'll just ask the witness before we			
23	play the call.			
24	Q Who are the participants to this phone call?			
25	A Abraxas Discala and Craig Josephberg.			

Case 1	14-cr-00399-ENV [ocument 665 Filed 10/20/18	Page 10 of 243 PageID #: 5848	
		VOULGARIS - DIRECT	- BINI 3014	
1	Q And what	s the date of the call	∟?	
2	A June 12th,	2014.		
3	Q The time of	f the call?		
4	A 9:53 a.m.			
5	MR. I	OWMAN: If we can now	publish it.	
6	(Audi	o recording played.)		
7	Q Now, Your	Honor, if we could pub	olish to the jury 198-52.	
8	THE (OURT: You may.		
9	(Exhi	bit published.)		
10	Q Special Ac	ent Voulgaris, who are	e the participants of this	
11	call?			
12	A Abraxas Di	scala and John Arlo.		
13	Q Who is Joh	n Arlo?		
14	A He was a	unior trader, broker a	at BMAC securities.	
15	Q And what	s the date of this cal	∟1?	
16	A June 12th,	2014.		
17	Q The time?			
18	A 10:02 a.m.			
19	Q Is BMAC se	curities where Darren	Goodrich also worked?	
20	A Yes.			
21	MR. E	OWMAN: If you could p	olay the call.	
22	(Audi	o recording played.)		
23	Q Special Ac	ent Voulgaris, during	the time that you were	
24	intercepting calls pursuant to the wiretap, were you also			
25	looking at stock prices?			

Case 1	14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 13 of 243 PageID #: 5851				
	VOULGARIS - CROSS - BOWMAN 3017				
1	A Yes.				
2	MR. BOWMAN: No further questions, Your Honor.				
3	THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Bini.				
4	Any cross?				
5	MR. BOWMAN: Yes, Your Honor.				
6	THE COURT: Mr. Bowman, you may cross for				
7	Mr. Discala.				
8	CROSS-EXAMINATION				
9	BY MR. BOWMAN:				
10	Q Agent Voulgaris, do you know who Joseph Salvani is?				
11	A Yes, sir, I recall the name from the investigation.				
12	Q And who is he?				
13	A At this time I don't know exactly what role he was or if				
14	he was just an investor.				
15	Q Did you know that Joseph Salvani, Dan Walsh, Jeff				
16	Auerbach and Eli Wahrsager introduced the CodeSmart				
17	transaction to Mr. Discala?				
18	A In part I know some of the individuals did, yes.				
19	Q Did you know that there was a 4 million-dollar pipe that				
20	had been committed to CodeSmart?				
21	A I guess, yes.				
22	Q And a 20 million-dollar student loan facility? Did you				
23	know that?				
24	A Off the top of my head, I don't recall.				
25	Q Did you know that over \$2 million was previously invested				

MR. BINI: Objection. Hearsay.

THE COURT: Sustained.

approximately \$2.3 million?

23

24

We did receive lucent data and bank analysis regarding in

At this time I don't recall if I came across those records. I

most certainly did. I do recall we subpoenaed those records.

23

24

Case 1	L4-cr-00399-ENV D	Oocument 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 20 of 243 F	PageID #: 5858		
		VOULGARIS - Cross - BOWMAN PROCEEDINGS	3024		
1	Q Can you se	ee the name Joseph Salvani?			
2	A Yes.				
3	Q Now, going	g across to the column where it says			
4	"freely-tradeable stock," can you tell us what Government				
5	Exhibit 177-27 says with respect to the freely-tradeable stock				
6	of Joe Salvani? How many shares did he have?				
7	A I'm sorry, are we talking about the highlighted in the				
8	yellow?				
9	Q Look at th	ne top, you'll see pre-trade, pre-spi	lit.		
10	A Okay.				
11	Q Okay?				
12	A Yes.				
13	Q Go down in	Go down in that column to find Joseph Salvani.			
14	A Correct.				
15	Q And how ma	any freely-tradeable shares did he ha	ave?		
16	A 312,500.				
17	Q And how ma	any post-split free-trade shares?			
18	A 2.5 millio	on.			
19	Q Now do you	know what Mr. Salvani received that	-		
20	freely-tradable stock for?				
21	A I don't re	ecall.			
22	Q Did you ev	ver know?			
23	A Possibly.	I don't know at this time.			
24	Q Did you ev	ver interview Mr. Salvani?			
25	A Not that I	recall.			

testified it's not a government agency, but it's a

Right, it's actually a -- I think we heard from somebody

at FINRA during the case that it's not actually -- the witness

23

24

VOULGARIS - CROSS - RIOPELLE

3029

1 did you find that my client had never been disciplined by the

- 2 Securities and Exchange Commission?
- 3 A I don't recall.
- 4 Q You have no recollection then of any discipline being
- 5 imposed on my client as an attorney who regularly practiced
- 6 before the SEC; isn't that a fact?
- 7 A That's correct, I don't recall.
- 8 Q Now this entity, FINRA, that we testified about, they
- 9 have -- they create something called a CRD; is that right?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q And you're familiar, based on your experience as an FBI
- 12 agent, and you told us about a little bit about experience in
- 13 the financial field, with that type of document, correct?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q Tell us what a CRD is.
- 16 A CRD, what aspect of it?
- 17 Q Well, is a CRD, does it describe generally the employment
- 18 history of a person who is a registered representative?
- 19 A Correct.
- 20 Q And can you unpack that a little bit for those of us who
- 21 | are not special agents who worked in C1 and tell us what that
- 22 means?
- 23 A Sure.
- 24 My experience with it is strictly what I recall just
- on C1. Basically if you know somebody that's a registered

- Q Right, and then that lists your employment history for the rest of the time that you work in the financial industry, right?
- 24 As long as your licenses don't lapse.
- Q Okay. And it also lists any disciplinary issues the

- 2.1 Okay. And did you obtain any CRDs in this case?
- 22 Yes.
- 23 Because, in fact, there were some of the subjects of your
- 24 investigation who were, in fact, registered representatives,
- 25 correct?

- 1 (Continuing.)
- 2 BY MR. RIOPELLE:
- 3 Q And do you recall that you were asked where you worked
- 4 primarily?
- 5 A Primarily, yes.
- 6 Q Yes. And you responded, if I understood you correctly,
- 7 that you worked primarily at BNP Paribas and Merrill Lynch,
- 8 correct?
- 9 A Yes, uh-huh.
- 10 Q And by the way, sir, there was a point in time when you
- 11 passed the Series 7 examination, correct?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q And a Series 24, what is that?
- 14 A I didn't receive a 24, sir.
- 15 Q Oh, you didn't. Okay. But you did pass a Series 7.
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q And that's the sort of entry-level examination --
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q -- to become a registered representative, correct?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q And you went to work at BNP Paribas, correct?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q And you became registered there, right?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q And it wouldn't surprise you to learn that there's a CRD

- 1 available online for someone named Constantine Voulgaris,
- 2 | would it?
- 3 A I'm sure there is.
- 4 Q And that CRD -- by the way, what did you do at BNP
- 5 Paribas?
- 6 A I started out working in the back office as a consultant
- 7 | through a, I guess, hiring/staffing agency.
- 8 Q Let's stop there.
- 9 A Sure.
- 10 Q And there you were basically making sure trades were
- 11 properly executed and things like that?
- 12 What kind of things were you doing in the back
- 13 office?
- 14 A More kind of accountant verification. I'm trying to
- 15 recall, sir; it was quite some time ago. A lot of time going
- 16 to Secretary of State websites to make sure that certain names
- were correct on the accounts, you know, their registration
- 18 hasn't lapsed or things like that.
- 19 Q Fair to say clerk-type of work?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 O And over time, you did other work at BNP Paribas?
- 22 A Yes. I got hired full-time or -- I got hired as a
- 23 permanent employee. I'm not certain how long I was at the
- 24 temp agency for.
- 25 Q Right.

- 1 A After I want to say maybe a year, I made the switch to
- 2 the front office.
- 3 Q Okay. And in the front office, what were you doing for
- 4 the front office at BNP Paribas?
- 5 A I was a client service associate working with the sales
- 6 and trade desk.
- 7 Q And what does a client service associate do with the
- 8 sales desk at BNP Paribas? What did you do?
- 9 A What I did, so, the sales and traders -- salesmen would
- 10 bring in clients, traders would book their trades on the
- 11 client service desk. I, you know, was given a list of
- 12 clients. Every few weeks or every month or quarterly, we'd
- 13 get trade requests, and I'd have to plug it into our systems,
- 14 | see if it worked out. Basically, day-to-day manage our
- 15 clients, but then when it came time for subscription monthly,
- 16 I'd deal with them a little more closely and pass the trades
- 17 on to our traders.
- 18 Q Am I right, again, this was kind of clerk-type of work?
- 19 A This was not clerk-type of work, no, not on the service
- desk.
- 21 Q You were not the sales trader yourself, correct?
- 22 A Correct, I was not.
- 23 Q You were supporting the people who were actually working
- 24 on the sales desk, correct?
- 25 A Correct.

- 1 Q And did you get another promotion from there at some
- 2 point?
- 3 A No.
- 4 Q So, you remained in a support role on the sales desk, the
- 5 institutional sales desk at BNP Paribas, for the period that
- 6 you worked there; is that a fair statement?
- 7 A That is correct.
- 8 Q Now, is it correct that you worked at BNP Paribas from
- 9 about June 2005 to about June 2008?
- 10 A As a permanent employee, I'd have to say I'm not certain
- 11 about the start date. But then prior to that, again, I was
- working through a staffing agency there for a considerable
- 13 amount of time.
- Sounds correct, though.
- 15 Q I'm sorry, I didn't mean to cut you off.
- 16 A It sounds generally correct. Not a hundred percent
- 17 certain about those dates.
- 18 Q And am I correct that you left BNP Paribas in about June
- 19 of 2008?
- 20 A Around that time, yes.
- 21 Q And was that a result of the fiscal crisis that was then
- 22 | erupting in the financial industry?
- 23 A Correct. I was laid off.
- 24 Q You were laid off from BNP Paribas after working there
- for about three years in a supporting role, correct?

- 1 MR. BINI: Objection, your Honor. Relevance.
- 2 Q You were a relatively junior employee and you were laid
- 3 off, correct?
- THE COURT: We've established that, Mr. Riopelle.
- 5 Why don't you move on?
- 6 Q And then you were you unemployed for about six months; is
- 7 that right?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q And it was then that you got your job at Merrill Lynch
- 10 that was one of your primary jobs in the financial industry,
- 11 | correct?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 Q And that was then in about December of 2008, wasn't it?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q And what job did you have at Merrill Lynch in December of
- 16 2008?
- 17 A The title I'm not certain about, but I was brought in to
- 18 work with retail clients on the brokerage side.
- 19 Q And was that as a junior broker type of a person?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q And you were trying to open accounts and things like
- 22 that?
- 23 A At that time I wasn't trying to open accounts, I was
- 24 mainly doing -- studying on their products as well as trying
- 25 to obtain additional licenses.

MR. RIOPELLE: I'm going to show you what I've marked Kyleen Cane CV-1.

RPR

23

24

25

Α

Sure.

LAM OCR RPR

who couldn't get loans from banks, right?

24

25

Yes.

- 17 called David Lerner Associates, right?
- That's correct. 18
- 19 And David Lerner Associates is a brokerage out on Long
- 20 Island, correct?
- 21 I believe they have multiple locations.
- 22 Did you work at the one on Long Island or the one in
- 23 Teaneck, New Jersey?
- 24 I was hired at the one in Teaneck, New Jersey, but I went
- 25 for onboarding for two days. I didn't actually work there.

MR. BINI: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q It's fair to say you worked at that firm considerably

24

- 1 longer than you worked at Merrill Lynch, isn't it?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q Now, at the time you went to the Securities and Exchange
- 4 Commission to research the background of persons who were
- 5 subjects of your investigation, am I correct that you looked
- 6 into a number of different people?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q Did the name Hunter Adams come up during your
- 9 investigation?
- 10 A It did.
- 11 Q And at the time you went to the Securities and Exchange
- 12 Commission, did you ask them if they had information about
- 13 Hunter Adams?
- 14 A I don't recall. I do remember the name in the course of
- 15 the investigation; I don't recall if I asked the SEC regarding
- 16 Hunter Adams.
- 17 Q Did you look into Hunter Adams or do you have a
- 18 recollection of that?
- 19 A I'm not sure how in depth we did. Again, I recall the
- 20 name.
- 21 Q Did you learn during your investigation that Mr. Adams
- 22 had a prior conviction for securities fraud?
- 23 A I don't recall right now.
- 24 Q Did you learn during your investigation that he
- 25 physically threatened Marc Wexler?

- 1 A I don't recall. If there's a document that I can refresh
- 2 my recollection...
- 3 Q Sure. Let me show you what's been marked Government
- 4 Exhibit 3500-MW-3.
- 5 A Thank you.
- 6 Q It's a relatively long document, but if you look at Page
- 7 9, that's where I'd like to direct your attention.
- 8 Have you had a chance to review that.
- 9 A The third paragraph, yes, I did.
- 10 Q By the way, this is a report written by Special Agent
- 11 Braconi?
- 12 A Correct.
- 13 Q And Special Agent Braconi was your partner in C-1 right?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q Because each special agent has a partner. That's the way
- 16 it works, isn't it?
- 17 A No.
- 18 Q But he was your partner?
- 19 A For this investigation.
- 20 Q For this investigation, correct?
- 21 A Correct.
- 22 Q So, having read this report, does it refresh your
- 23 recollection that you learned during your investigation that
- 24 Mr. Adams physically threatened Marc Wexler?
- 25 A I'm sure I reviewed this and learned about it. Seeing

- 1 this refreshes my recollection of Hunter Adams. I don't
- 2 recall that specific line, but I'm sure I reviewed this
- 3 before.
- 4 Q Did you learn that by virtue of this physical threat
- 5 Mr. Adams effectively extorted money from Mr. Wexler and the
- 6 other shareholders in Cubed?
- 7 A The report says that Wexler and Discala gave Adams his
- 8 investment back.
- 9 Q And do you know whether other investors got their entire
- 10 investment back in Cubed or was it just Mr. Adams?
- 11 A This says Mr. Adams received his money back and that
- 12 potentially he had his investment in his sister-in-law's name.
- 13 Q And, so, did you, when you got information like this,
- 14 | investigate Mr. Adams further?
- 15 A I don't recall.
- 16 Q Let me ask you this: Was Mr. Adams some kind of
- 17 informant for you in this investigation?
- 18 A For me, personally? No.
- 19 Q For the FBI, to your knowledge?
- 20 A To my knowledge, no.
- 21 Q So, you just never looked into this conduct; is that
- 22 right?
- 23 A I don't recall if we looked into it any further than
- 24 this.
- 25 Q You did nothing about a physical threat to one of your

```
Case 1;14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 41 of 243 PageID #: 5879
                        Voulgaris - Cross - Riopelle
                                                                3045
  1
      witnesses; is that your testimony?
  2
           I don't recall. I didn't do anything.
  3
           Now, do you recall that the Securities and Exchange
  4
      Commission brought a civil complaint at the time that the FBI
  5
      arrested the Defendants in your case?
  6
           Yes.
  7
          And do you recall that --
  8
                MR. BINI: Objection, your Honor. Request for
  9
      sidebar.
10
                 THE COURT: Sure.
11
12
                 (Continued on the next page.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

SIDEBAR

3046 1 (The following occurred at sidebar.) 2 MR. BINI: Your Honor, the Government objects to 3 this line of questioning because I believe that Cane counsel is going to the SEC complaint, which does not include 4 5 Ms. Cane. And, of course, we're not permitted to share 6 wiretaps with the SEC. And, in any event, this is not an incident where he can take advantage of Rule 408 to put in 7 8 evidence regarding a parallel investigation in this case. 9 So, the Government objects to this line of 10 questioning as both hearsay from the SEC, A; B, on 403 grounds as confusing to the jury and irrelevant. 11 12 MR. RIOPELLE: Your Honor, it is a fact that my client was not named in the SEC complaint. I think this 13 14 witness has indicated that he and the FBI did share 15 information with the SEC. The SEC, of course, has a much 16 lower burden of proof to file a complaint than the Government 17 has here, so I don't see that there's any harm in pointing out 18 that the SEC never charged my client with anything. 19 THE COURT: It's out on 403 grounds. 20 MR. RIOPELLE: Thank you, your Honor. 21 22 (Continued on next page.) 23 24

Case 1;14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 43 of 243 PageID #: 5881 Voulgaris - Cross - Riopelle 3047 1 (Sidebar ends; in open court.) 2 THE COURT: Mr. Riopelle. 3 MR. RIOPELLE: Yes. 4 BY MR. RIOPELLE: 5 Special Agent Voulgaris, I believe you told us that you and the other agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation 6 7 interviewed a number of the subjects of your investigation; 8 correct? Yes. You also interviewed some of the persons you thought were 10 11 victims of the conduct that you were investigating, correct? 12 Yes. And you also interviewed persons who you regarded as 13 14 simply witnesses to material events, correct? 15 Yes. 16 You mentioned a person named George Castillo during your 17 direct examination; do you recall that? 18 Yes. 19 And that was a name of significance to you in your 20 investigation, correct? 21 Α Yes. 22 Mr. Castillo was the broker at Glendale Securities, 23 correct? 24 Yeah, he was a broker at Glendale.

And he, in fact, was the broker for an account of David

- 1 Ben-Bassat; am I correct?
- 2 A Correct.
- 3 Q And Mr. Castillo was interviewed by the FBI; is that
- 4 correct?
- 5 A He was.
- 6 Q And there was a report written by the FBI in connection
- 7 | with that interview, correct?
- 8 A There was.
- 9 Q And am I correct that there was no follow-up interview
- 10 | that you're aware of with Mr. Castillo?
- 11 THE COURT: Subsequent to the report.
- MR. RIOPELLE: Subsequent to the report, yes.
- 13 A Not that I can recall.
- 14 Q Now, I think you told us that, in fact -- let me see what
- 15 we have here.
- I think we looked at in your direct exam some text
- 17 messages between my client and George Castillo; do you recall
- 18 those?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q And you had those text messages at the time you
- 21 interviewed Mr. Castillo, correct?
- 22 A I don't recall. If you could show me the date of the
- 23 interview and...
- 24 Q Sure. Let me show you what's been marked for
- 25 identification as Government 35-HS-1.

Voulgaris - Cross - Riopelle 3049 1 MR. RIOPELLE: May I approach the witness, your 2 Honor? 3 THE COURT: You may. 4 MR. RIOPELLE: Forgot to ask the last time. 5 about that. 6 Having reviewed this report, does it refresh your 7 recollection that the interview of Mr. Castillo occurred in 8 October of 2014? 9 Α Yes. 10 By that time, you had -- the FBI had, I should say, 11 arrested my client, Kyleen Cane, correct? 12 Α Yes. 13 And at that point, at the time of her arrest, the agents arresting her seized her cell phone; am I right? 14 15 Yes. 16 And a search warrant was obtained for her cell phone, 17 correct? 18 That's correct. 19 And that's how the FBI got the text messages from her 20 phone, correct?

- 21 Α Yes.
- 22 So, by this point, October of 2014, it's correct to say,
- 23 is it not, that the FBI had in its possession the text
- 24 messages between my client and Mr. Castillo?
- 25 I can't say with certainty that they were extracted from

- 1 | the phone yet, that the phone was imaged at that point, but we
- 2 did have the phone in our possession.
- 3 Q You did have the phone in your possession.
- 4 A Correct.
- 5 Q And is it correct to say that during your investigation,
- 6 the FBI's investigation, I should say, the FBI obtained
- 7 records relating to the Ben-Bassat account at Glendale
- 8 Securities?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q And is it correct to say that the records that had been
- 11 obtained were in the FBI's possession when they had an
- 12 opportunity to interview, and they did interview,
- 13 Mr. Castillo?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q And by the way, I don't remember if we saw this on your
- direct exam, but you know, do you not, that among the records
- 17 at Glendale Securities is a trading authorization by which
- 18 Mr. Ben-Bassat gives my client, Ms. Cane, authorization to
- 19 place trades in his account at Glendale Securities?
- 20 A I did review that document, yes.
- 21 Q Okay. And just so we're clear, that document is a
- 22 standard type of document, I want to say, in the securities
- 23 | industry. This does happen, correct?
- 24 A I believe it does. I'm not certain if this is the
- 25 standard document or --

- 1 Q Right, you don't know what the form is, but it is correct
- 2 to say, is it not, that it is not unusual for a person with a
- 3 securities account to give another person the authorization to
- 4 | enter trades in that account?
- 5 A I'm not certain how common it is.
- 6 Q But it does happen, correct?
- 7 A I believe so, yes.
- 8 Q And this is not the only time in the history of the
- 9 securities industry it's ever happened, correct?
- 10 A I wouldn't say so, yes.
- 11 Q And there's nothing, by the way, illegal in one person
- 12 giving another person the authority to trade in their account?
- 13 A As long as it's documented properly.
- 14 Q And you have no reason to believe that the document in
- 15 this case was an improper documentation.
- 16 A I don't believe so.
- 17 Q Now, among the items that we have seen in evidence --
- MR. RIOPELLE: Could we have the Elmo on,
- 19 Mr. Villanueva?
- Thank you. I'm going to use the Elmo so we can
- 21 speed through this a little bit.
- Q Government Exhibit 149-4 in evidence, do you see this
- 23 | item here, Special Agent Voulgaris?
- 24 (Exhibit published to the jury.)
- 25 A Yes.

- 1 Q The top document here is something called a "trade
- 2 | confirmation;" is that right?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q And based on your experience working in the securities
- 5 industry and your experience in Squad C-1, you know what a
- 6 trade confirmation is, correct?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q Tell us what a trade confirmation is?
- 9 A Generally, it's just a receipt of a securities
- 10 transaction.
- 11 Q And it tells the owner of the account what trade was
- 12 executed in his or her account, correct?
- 13 A That's correct.
- 14 Q And, indeed, these confirmations are required to be sent
- out within a certain period of time from the trade, correct?
- 16 A I'm not certain about that.
- 17 Q But you will concede that this does give the owner of the
- 18 account notice of what's going on in his account, correct?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q And do you understand, based on your experience, that
- 21 typically the confirm might come before the month end
- 22 statement, correct, or do you know that?
- 23 A I can't say for certain.
- 24 Q Now I'm just looking at the top trade here. This
- describes the order at issue.

- And when we say an "order," what are we referring
- 2 to, you and I?
- 3 A A trade.
- 4 Q The trade. Somebody has to order a trade, right?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q And there are many different kinds of orders, but one way
- 7 | that an order can -- it's either solicited or unsolicited.
- 8 That's one characteristic of an order or a trade; correct?
- 9 A That's correct.
- 10 Q And a broker, do you know that brokers are required to
- 11 mark on their paperwork whether an order is solicited or not
- 12 solicited?
- 13 A I believe they do.
- 14 Q And the idea there is that a solicited order is one that
- 15 the broker is proposing to the client, correct?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q And an unsolicited order is one that the client is asking
- 18 the broker to execute, correct?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q And, so, on this one we see it's an unsolicited order,
- 21 correct?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q And what that tells us is that the order has originated
- 24 with the client, correct?
- 25 A Yes.

1 Q And do you know as you sit here whether all of the orders

relating to Cubed in the Ben-Bassat account are unsolicited?

A I don't know if I can look through the trading records.

Q Let me show you Government Exhibit 149-4 and just ask you

to flip through quickly -- it won't take you that long -- and

tell me whether all the orders are unsolicited.

A Thank you.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Riopelle, while he's doing that, can you give me a ballpark of how long you have?

MR. RIOPELLE: I probably have a good 'nother half-hour to an hour, depending on how it goes, Judge.

THE COURT: Then we'll do after this question --

MR. RIOPELLE: Take our break.

14 THE COURT: Yes.

MR. RIOPELLE: Perfect.

THE COURT: Or do you have more questions with respect to this document?

MR. RIOPELLE: Yes, I have a fairly long continuing exam in this line, but this is a good place to break.

THE COURT: After the answer to the pending question.

MR. RIOPELLE: Yes, he'll tell us whether the orders are unsolicited or not, if he doesn't die of paper cuts before.

Q You've had a chance to look at them all?

THE COURT: Court is back in session. All counsel are present as well as the Defendants.

(Recess taken.)

23

24

Case 1;14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 52 of 243 PageID #: 5890 Voulgaris - Cross - Riopelle 3056 1 Are you ready, Mr. Riopelle? 2 MR. RIOPELLE: I just need the witness, Judge. 3 (Witness resumes the stand.) (Jury enters.) 5 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Counsel will stipulate that the jury is present and 6 7 properly seated? 8 MS. JONES: Yes, your Honor. 9 MR. ROSS: Yes, Judge. 10 MR. RIOPELLE: Yes, Judge. 11 THE COURT: Thank you, counsel. 12 Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. Special Agent Voulgaris is back on the stand and Mr. Riopelle will continue 13 14 his cross-examination. 15 MR. RIOPELLE: Thank you, your Honor. May I 16 inquire? 17 THE COURT: You may. 18 BY MR. RIOPELLE: 19 Special Agent Voulgaris, before we broke we were talking 20 about orders for securities and how some orders are solicited 21 and some orders are unsolicited; do you remember that 22 testimony? 23 Yes. 24 Is it correct that there are other ways -- that there's 25 something called a "limit order"? Let me just cut right to

- 1 the chase.
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q And a limit order is an order given to a broker that
- 4 limits the broker's discretion in executing the order; is that
- 5 | a fair statement?
- 6 A I'm not certain right off the top of my head.
- 7 Q Do you understand, a limit order is fairly common in the
- 8 securities industry; is it not?
- 9 A Again, "common," depends what kind of product you're
- 10 dealing with. I don't know how common it would be.
- 11 Q How about trading an ordinary stock, fairly common in
- 12 that context?
- 13 A I believe so.
- 14 Q Now, a limit order can be limited in terms of the price
- of execution, correct?
- 16 A Again, off the top of my head, I can't recall, but, yeah,
- 17 you would set certain parameters.
- 18 Q And that's all I'm trying to get at, that if a customer
- 19 gave his or her broker a limit order they might tell the
- 20 broker don't sell below a certain price, correct?
- 21 THE COURT: Can a customer do that?
- 22 Q Can a customer do that?
- 23 A I believe so.
- Q In fact, it is commonly done; is it not?
- 25 A Again, I don't know how common, but I'll...

- 1 Q Would it be fair to say that it happens every day in the
- 2 securities industry?
- 3 A I'm sure it does.
- 4 Q And another way that an order might be limited would be
- 5 as to time, correct?
- 6 Sell today or don't sell, correct?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q Now, there are also something called "market orders,"
- 9 right?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q And that's when you call -- the customer calls the broker
- 12 and says, Just sell at whatever price the market is at,
- 13 correct?
- 14 A I believe so, yes.
- 15 Q Now, we saw that the orders in Government Exhibit
- 16 149-4 -- those are those trade confirmations -- were all
- 17 unsolicited orders, correct?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q And I think we established that unsolicited orders are
- 20 those orders that are communicated to a broker by the
- 21 customer, correct?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q And is there such a thing as a "standing" order?
- 24 A Possibly. I'm not familiar with the term.
- Q Well, it's not uncommon, is it, for a customer to give

- 1 | instructions to a broker that remain in place over time?
- 2 A I'm not familiar with a standing order. I don't know if
- 3 it's common or not.
- 4 Q You've never heard of, despite your experience in the
- 5 securities industry, an order, for example, to, Sell these
- 6 shares at the best price you can get in the market over time.
- 7 A I guess it's possible.
- 8 Q I'm not asking to you guess. You worked on a sales desk,
- 9 right?
- 10 A It was a different product line.
- 11 Q Okay.
- 12 A I wouldn't deal with those kind of orders.
- 13 O You didn't deal with those kind of orders.
- 14 You worked at Merrill Lynch for three months. Do
- 15 you remember ever dealing with an order like that at Merrill
- 16 Lynch, one that stayed open over time?
- 17 A Again, I didn't deal with clients at Merrill Lynch .
- 18 Q You do know based on your investigation that the trades
- 19 executed in the Ben-Bassat account were all executed over \$5.
- 20 You know that, don't you?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q And you know from your investigation that those trades
- 23 were executed over a couple of months of time, correct?
- 24 A Correct.
- 25 Q Primarily, May and June of 2014, correct?

- 1 A April through June.
- 2 Q End of April through June, how about that?
- 3 A Okay.
- 4 Q And you know from your investigation that there were few
- 5 communications between Mr. Ben-Bassat and the broker at
- 6 Glendale, correct?
- 7 A There was some, I don't what you determine a "few" is.
- 8 O There were some.
- 9 Is it fair to say, having now looked at -- and you
- 10 know there were a lot of orders in the account, correct?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Is it fair to say, based on your recollection of the
- 13 investigation that you conducted, that there was not a
- 14 | communication between Mr. Ben-Bassat and Mr. Castillo every
- 15 | time one of these orders was executed?
- 16 A The best I can recall, not every time.
- 17 Q In fact -- I don't think I have it.
- Do you recall that there was a chart prepared that
- 19 showed the communications between Mr. Ben-Bassat and
- 20 Mr. Castillo?
- 21 Did you ever see that chart?
- 22 A I don't think I did.
- 23 Q Now, you did have my client's cell phone, correct?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q And you did -- the FBI, not you personally, the FBI,

3061

1 those guys in the IT unit or whatever they are, they extracted

- from my client's cell phone certain text messages, correct?
- 3 A They imaged the phone.
- 4 Q And ultimately obtained messages from my client's phone?
- 5 A As part of the image, yes.
- 6 Q As part of the image.
- 7 And some of those text messages were communications
- 8 between my client and Mr. Castillo, correct?
- 9 A Yes.

- 10 Q But it is correct to say, is it not, that those text
- 11 messages do not account for all these orders; is that right?
- 12 A Correct.
- 13 Q There are a limited number of text messages as compared
- 14 to the large number of orders, correct?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q And am I correct that during your investigation the FBI
- 17 obtained phone records relating to my client?
- 18 A I believe so, yes.
- 19 Q And I take it that you or other persons of the FBI would
- 20 analyze those phone records.
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q Do you recall, as you sit here now, the fact that those
- 23 phone records do not show a phone call from my client to
- 24 Mr. Castillo in connection with each one of these orders?
- 25 A I don't recall. I don't know if I even saw the raw

- 1 | records. I've seen the analysis, I'm sure.
- 2 Q So, as you sit here today, it's fair to say, to tie off
- 3 this line of inquiry, that you are not aware of a contact
- 4 between either Mr. Ben-Bassat or my client with Mr. Castillo
- 5 before each one of these orders was executed?
- 6 A I can't say for certain.
- 7 Q Right. And, therefore, it's true, isn't it, that these
- 8 | confirms that we have in Government Exhibit 149-4 are
- 9 consistent with the notion of a single order at the beginning
- 10 of the trading activity which was then executed over time by
- 11 Mr. Castillo?
- 12 That's an explanation for the evidence that you
- 13 | found in your investigation; is it not?
- 14 A I didn't come to that conclusion.
- 15 Q Pardon?
- 16 A I didn't come to that conclusion.
- 17 Q You didn't come to that conclusion despite the fact that
- 18 you were unable to find a phone call from my client to
- 19 Mr. Castillo or a text from my client to Mr. Castillo in
- 20 connection with each one of these orders, correct?
- 21 A I would have to review the toll records to do the actual
- 22 analysis right now to see if there's communication, whether it
- 23 be voice communication or text communication, to Mr. Castillo.
- 24 Q As you sit here now, you're not aware of such
- 25 | communication?

- 1 A I don't recall.
- 2 Q You'd have to go back and look again at the results of
- 3 your investigation, correct?
- 4 A Correct.
- 5 Q Isn't it a fact, sir, that these confirmations are
- 6 | consistent with a standing order to sell shares above \$5?
- A Again, I'm not familiar with what a standing order is.
- 8 never worked with that.
- 9 Q Now, we did see some texts during your direct examination
- 10 and we have seen some during the trial. I'd like to show
- 11 you --
- By the way, one last thing. In Mr. Ben-Bassat's
- 13 account at Glendale in Cubed, is it correct, sir, that
- 14 Mr. Ben-Bassat did not buy any shares of Cubed during the time
- period that his account was actively trading those shares?
- 16 A He was selling shares.
- 17 Q He was only selling, correct?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Thank you.
- Now I'd like to show you Government Exhibit 129-105,
- 21 which I believe is in evidence. And you may have even looked
- 22 at it during your direct exam.
- 23 (Exhibit published to the jury.)
- 24 Q These, I believe, are texts --
- 25 MR. BINI: That was not admitted. Objection.

3064

1 MR. RIOPELLE: I'll take it off. Sorry about that.

- 2 Q Do you recall, as you sit here now, that there were text
- 3 | messages from Mr. Discala to my client requesting that she
- 4 order Mr. Castillo to buy stock in Cubed?
- 5 A I don't recall. I'd have to see some kind of record.
- 6 Q Let me show you what's been marked Government Exhibit
- 7 129-05 for identification.
- 8 Have you had a chance to review that?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Does that refresh your recollection that there were
- 11 occasions when Mr. Discala asked my client to instruct
- 12 Mr. Castillo to buy shares of Cubed?
- 13 A I don't recall putting my eyes on this before --
- 14 | potentially, I did -- but, yes, it shows that Mr. Discala is
- 15 requesting Ms. Cane to purchase.
- 16 O And, in fact, we know from your testimony just a moment
- 17 | ago that didn't happen, right?
- 18 A Correct.
- 19 Q Ms. Cane, to use the vernacular, shined Mr. Discala on
- that one, correct?
- MR. BOWMAN: Objection, your Honor.
- 22 Q Ms. Cane did not execute the order requested by
- 23 Mr. Discala, correct?
- 24 A I don't know if there was direction given to George to
- 25 execute the order. George would be doing the execution.

about this on your direct exam.

23 A Yes.

24 Q And there's typically what's called a little spread

25 between those?

- 1 A Correct.
- 2 Q So, with that in mind, what Mr. Wexler appears to be
- 3 asking my client to do in this case is to move the price --
- 4 ask Mr. Castillo to move the price at which he is offering to
- 5 buy shares of Cubed, correct?
- A I don't see any reference to asking him to move anything,
- 7 just asking about "left."
- 8 Q There's reference to asking Mr. Castillo about his bid to
- 9 buy shares of Cubed, correct?
- 10 A From this, I can't infer if it's his bid or just a bid.
- 11 Q So, in any event, we know that the Ben-Bassat account
- 12 never did buy shares in Cubed, correct?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 | Q During your direct examination, I believe you were shown
- 15 a series of texts between a gentleman named Joe Laxague and my
- 16 | client, Kyleen Cane; do you remember that?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q And those texts related to a company called Northwest
- 19 Resources; am I right?
- 20 A Some of them, yes.
- 21 Q And I just want to review them briefly with you now.
- 22 (Exhibit published to the jury.)
- 23 Q This is Government Exhibit 129-92, and it talks about
- 24 somebody named Jeff Chong and Northwest Remmington and
- 25 Thompson, correct?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q And Jeff Chong -- and this text, by the way, is in March
- 3 of 2013, correct?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q That is almost a year before my client began working with
- 6 the company that became Cubed, correct?
- 7 A Northwest Resources did become Cubed.
- 8 Q Okay. But how about Crackpot? Crackpot, my client
- 9 didn't begin to work with Crackpot until early 2014; isn't
- 10 | that right?
- 11 A I'd have to see the records when they were for certain
- 12 communicating, but it was at this time.
- 13 Q In any event, this fellow Jeff Chong he was not a subject
- 14 of your investigation in the Cubed investigation, correct?
- 15 A Not that I can recall.
- 16 Q And in March of 2013, the transaction that ultimately
- 17 resulted in Cubed had not yet begun, correct?
- 18 A Correct.
- 19 Q So, this text doesn't directly have anything to do with
- 20 Cubed, correct?
- 21 THE COURT: With Cubed in mind?
- MR. RIOPELLE: Yes.
- 23 Q There's no indication that Jeff Chong had anything to do
- 24 with Cubed. You didn't find that in your investigation.
- 25 A Not that I can recall.

```
Case 1:14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 65 of 243 PageID #: 5903
                       Voulgaris - Cross - Riopelle
                                                               3069
  1
      Q
           Let's look at another one.
  2
                 (Exhibit published to the jury.)
  3
           Government Exhibit 129-93, I think you testified a little
      bit about this one. This is, again --
  5
                MR. BINI: There was no testimony about that.
  6
                MR. RIOPELLE: Okay. We'll skip that one.
  7
                How about 129-94, did we have any testimony on that
  8
      one?
  9
                MR. BINI: We did.
10
                 (Exhibit published to the jury.)
11
           Let's look at 129-94. This, again, is a series of text
12
      messages between Joe Laxague and my client, correct?
13
      Α
           Yes.
14
           And if we look down, there is a reference to Northwest
15
      Resources, correct?
16
           Yes.
17
           And there's talk about potentially selling that company
18
      to somebody named Lazar, correct?
19
      Α
           Yes.
20
           And it goes on over there and there's talk about a cost
21
      or a sales price of 300,000 for each of the companies
22
      mentioned in the texts, correct?
23
           For each -- if you could, scroll it.
24
           There's Northwest and Thompson there.
25
           Okay, yes.
```

- 1 Q And you see the last text is 300 each.
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q And this fellow Lazar, he was -- and these texts are all
- 4 going on in June of 2013, correct?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q And that is long before the transaction begins that is
- 7 | connected to -- that results in the company called Cubed,
- 8 right?
- 9 A Right.
- 10 Q And this fellow Lazar, he is not a subject -- he was not
- 11 a subject of your investigation in this case, correct?
- 12 A Not that I can recall.
- 13 Q And am I correct that these text messages are about
- 14 trying to sell Northwest Resources long before it was sold in
- 15 connection with the transaction that resulted in Cubed?
- 16 A Yeah.
- 17 Q And there are texts about selling the company to somebody
- 18 other than a person who was a subject of your investigation
- 19 insofar as it related to Cubed?
- 20 A In relation to Lazar and Jeff Chong, yes.
- 21 Q Thank you. I was just going to go ask, Jeff Chong is the
- 22 same story, right?
- 23 A Yes.
- MR. RIOPELLE: I'm going to rely on the Government.
- 25 129-95, is that in evidence?

Q And this fellow Burton, whoever Burton is, he was never a

24

25

This is before the Cubed transaction occurred, yes.

LAM OCR RPR

- 1 letting my client know that someone wants to know what the
- 2 | cost of Northwest Resources is, correct?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q And this is going on in October of 2013?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q And that, again, is before my client became involved in
- 7 | the transaction that resulted ultimately in Cubed, correct?
- 8 A I believe it is, yes.
- 9 Q And this fellow David Lazar was never a subject of your
- 10 investigation in this case.
- 11 A No, I don't believe so.
- 12 Q In fact, at the time of that last text message,
- October 13, there was a lawyer who was a subject of your
- 14 investigation named Darren Ofsink, correct?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 Q And Mr. Ofsink was a lawyer who had been involved in a
- 17 series of transactions prior to the Cubed transaction,
- 18 correct?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q And do you recall that during your investigation you
- 21 discovered that Mr. Ofsink was, in fact, the lawyer for Cubed
- 22 at beginning?
- 23 A I believe so.
- 24 Q And my client came along sort of halfway through that
- 25 | deal; correct, or partway through it?

LAM OCR RPR

As we know from just a few minutes ago, I can't remember

Correct. It was quite some time ago too.

24

- 1 everything that was admitted in evidence either. So, we're
- 2 | not going to fault anybody for not remembering all the
- 3 documents. I'd be in trouble.
- In any event, this Government exhibit is dated
- 5 March 2014; is that correct?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q And you don't dispute that this document appears to be a
- 8 | formal retainer agreement by which Cubed retained or
- 9 Crackpot -- I forget which it is -- retained my client,
- 10 Ms. Cane, correct?
- 11 A Can I look through the document?
- 12 Q That document is admitted in evidence. So, you don't
- have any reason to believe that that document is not genuine
- 14 correct?
- 15 A No, but I can't say either way. I'd like to look at it
- 16 to...
- 17 Q Take your time, take your time.
- 18 Have you had a chance to look at that?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 Q Does that appear to you to be a formal retainer agreement
- 21 by which my client was formally retained?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q And it is dated in March of 2014, correct?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q And you have no reason to think that document is not

22 Q And then the next message is outgoing from my client to

23 Mr. Discala, right?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And that reads: Very good. DTC fixed, name change

```
Case 1;14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 73 of 243 PageID #: 5911
                        Voulgaris - Cross - Riopelle
                                                                3077
  1
      started, split started, Doug moving in as CEO, drafting
  2
      licensing deal all in motion just as in plan I sent.
  3
                 That was my client's message to Mr. Discala,
  4
      correct?
  5
           Yes.
  6
           And you understand that message to refer to a series of
  7
      legal things that had to be dealt with; right, like the DTC?
  8
                 You know that's the Depository Trust Company?
  9
           In order to trade securities electronically, you deposit
10
      with the DTC.
11
12
                 (Continued on next page.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Case 1;14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 74 of 243 PageID #: 5912

- C. VOULGARIS CROSS MR. RIOPELLE 3078
- 1 CONTINUED CROSS EXAMINATION
- 2 BY MR. RIOPELLE:
- 3 Q And this refers to DTC fixed, so something was done
- 4 there, right?
- 5 A I presume.
- 6 Q Right. And it says, name change started, know there was
- 7 a name change in the company, correct?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q Again, that's a legal thing that lawyers have to fool
- 10 around with, right?
- 11 A I assume.
- 12 Q Okay. And then it says, split started. There was a
- 13 stock split in this case, correct?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q And that again is requires filings with the SEC and
- 16 places like that, correct?
- 17 A Yes.
- 18 Q And that's something a lawyer handles, right?
- 19 A I don't know if it is required to have an attorney to
- 20 file it.
- 21 Q But it has to be a filed, correct?
- 22 A There has to be a filing.
- 23 Q The next reference is the Doug moved in as CEO. You
- recognize that to be a reference to Doug Shinsato, correct?
- 25 A Yes.

- 1 Q And Doug Shinsato was a business person, right?
- 2 A He was the former COO of Crackpot.
- 3 Q And he -- at any point did you interview Mr. Shinsato?
- 4 A Not that I can recall. I didn't personally.
- 5 Q Okay. In any event, so far as you know Mr. Shinsato is a
- 6 legitimate business person, correct?
- 7 A I can't make that assumption.
- 8 Q Did you arrest Mr. Shinsato?
- 9 A No.
- 10 Q Mr. Shinsato continued to work with the company that
- 11 became Cubed from the time of this text until the time of the
- 12 | arrests in this case; is that right?
- 13 A I don't know the duration of his employment when it
- 14 ended.
- 15 Q But you don't have any information that he resigned from
- 16 Cubed at any point prior to the arrests in this case, do you?
- 17 A I can't recall.
- 18 Q You don't have any information to suggest that
- 19 Mr. Shinsato was some kind of criminal, do you?
- 20 A I'd have to look at his, any records we have pulled in
- 21 the past, but I can't recall a criminal history.
- 22 Q Then there is a reference to drafting a licensing deal.
- 23 Based on your investigation you understood that there were
- 24 licensing deals that were done with the company that became
- 25 Cubed?

C. VOULGARIS - CROSS - MR. RIOPELLE 3080

- 1 A I don't recall.
- 2 Q Do you recall a company called Ping Mobile?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q And do you recall a company called Wiki Technologies?
- 5 A Something to that effect, Wiki Technologies, yes.
- 6 Q Do you recall that there were public filings issued by
- 7 Cubed or filed by Cubed with the SEC from time to time?
- 8 A There were filings, yes.
- 9 Q And do you recall that some of those filings discussed
- 10 the licensing transactions between Cubed and Ping Mobile and
- 11 Wiki Technologies and other companies?
- 12 A I don't recall the licensing aspect of those filings at
- 13 all.
- 14 Q Do you recall that those filings disclosed transactions
- 15 between Cubed and Wiki Technologies and Ping Mobile?
- 16 A Those specific transactions, I don't recall those.
- 17 Q Very well. I'm going to show you Government's Exhibit
- 18 | 11, which is in evidence. This is what is called an 8K
- 19 report. You're familiar in general with 8K reports, correct?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q And an 8K report is something that a company files when
- 22 there is a significant event and it wishes to inform its
- 23 shareholders of that event; is that a fair statement?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q And this one relates to change in name from Northwest

- C. VOULGARIS CROSS MR. RIOPELLE 3081
- 1 Resources to Cubed?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q And by the way, there is nothing -- a company is allowed
- 4 to change its name if it wishes to, correct?
- 5 A I believe so.
- 6 Q And if a public company does that, it has to file an 8K
- 7 report though, correct?
- 8 A Yes, I would say so.
- 9 Q And that's what this report was that we just looked at,
- 10 Government's Exhibit 11, it's an 8K that described the name
- 11 change?
- 12 A Amongst other things, yes.
- 13 Q And it's in effect telling the shareholders of the
- 14 | company that its name will be Cubed going forward?
- 15 A I'm not sure that's how they told their shareholders.
- 16 O In fact it tells the market that, correct, the public?
- 17 A Yes if they filed it with the SEC it's a public filing.
- 18 Q Those filings with the SEC are available to mere mortals
- 19 like me, correct?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q I can go to the Edgar system on the SEC's website and see
- 22 filings for any company I'd like, correct?
- 23 A Yes.
- Q When this one of these filings, like Government's Exhibit
- 25 11 is done, the company in question is essentially making a

- 1 disclosure to the entire market, correct?
- 2 A They are filing, they are filing that disclosure with the
- 3 SEC.
- 4 Q And by doing so, it becomes available to every member of
- 5 the general public?
- 6 A Yes.
- 7 Q Or least anybody with access to the Internet?
- 8 A I would say so.
- 9 Q Now do you recall that during your direct examination you
- 10 gave us some testimony about press releases?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q And you testified that you learned in the course of your
- 13 investigation or you found that there was trading going on
- 14 that was coordinated with press releases?
- 15 A Yes.
- 16 O And those -- did those findings include the fact that
- 17 the -- you know who Marc Wexler is, right?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q And he was a person who was trading in the stock of
- 20 Cubed, correct?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q And indeed, he was buying and selling in Cubed from time
- 23 to time, correct?
- 24 A I would want to see trading records to verify what he was
- 25 buying or selling.

securities professionals, premarket means before the market

23

24

25

opens, right?

Yes.

- C. VOULGARIS CROSS MR. RIOPELLE 3084
- 1 Q And the market opens 8:00 o'clock or nine?
- 2 A Nine.
- 3 Q And so do you understand that Mr. Wexler is complaining
- 4 here about the fact that a press release has not been issued
- 5 | that morning?
- 6 A From this I can't tell what he's complaining about or if
- 7 he's complaining.
- 8 Q In any event, his next communication says, we'll call you
- 9 later. AJ is going ballistic. I'll handle it. Correct?
- 10 A That's what it says.
- 11 Q He is reporting to my client, Ms. Cane, frustration or
- 12 irritation at least on the part of Mr. Discala, correct?
- 13 A He's saying AJ is going ballistic. I don't know, I don't
- 14 know what he's going ballistic regarding.
- 15 Q Let's go to the next page and see if that helps. Do you
- 16 see that in the text message there at the top of the page
- 17 Mr. Wexler is asking my client, Ms. Cane, to consider letting
- 18 | him run the press?
- 19 A That's what he's asking.
- 20 Q With that text message in mind, does that remind you that
- 21 Mr. Wexler was often irritated at my client because press
- releases were not issued in a way that he wanted?
- 23 A Based on this I can't see if he's irritated or not. He's
- 24 just answering the question.
- Q Can I take it over; that's what he's asking?

- C. VOULGARIS CROSS MR. RIOPELLE 3085
- 1 A Would you guys consider letting me run press. I can't
- 2 say whether he's frustrated or not based on this.
- 3 Q You can say he's asking to run the press himself,
- 4 correct?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q He was never allowed to run the press himself, though,
- 7 was he?
- 8 A I can't recall if he was or wasn't.
- 9 Q Your findings in this investigation do not include a
- 10 | finding that Mr. Wexler was allowed to run the press, correct?
- 11 A No. My findings was that Ms. Cane was coordinating the
- 12 press releases.
- 13 Q Right. And if we look down to the bottom, she reports to
- 14 Mr. Wexler that there is a new agent, somebody named Kirt
- 15 Darich who's gotten involved, correct?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q I'm showing you now Government's Exhibit 129-42. The
- 18 incoming message on the top is from Mr. Wexler to my client,
- 19 correct?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 Q And he says, no news today, question mark, wow. Correct?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q Does that indicate that Mr. Wexler is frustrated with my
- 24 | client's handling of the press releases?
- 25 A I would say he's surprised.

- C. VOULGARIS CROSS MR. RIOPELLE 3086
- 1 Q Okay. I'll take surprised. At the bottom he sends
- 2 another text saying, there is real confusion developing on my
- 3 end. Do you see that?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q And my client responds, okay, talk to you then. And
- 6 Mr. Wexler say thank you. Correct?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q And is it correct to say that after this text message
- 9 Mr. Wexler was still not given the job or task of running the
- 10 press for Cubed?
- 11 A I don't recall him ever running the press for Cubed.
- 12 Q Now during your testimony we heard a series of phone
- 13 calls in which Mr. Discala and my client discuss the price of
- 14 the bid or ask that is being set by George Castillo at
- 15 Glendale, correct?
- 16 A They are talking about George and the prices, yes.
- 17 Q And they are not talking, however, about prices at which
- 18 George will execute the securities, right, or execute the
- 19 orders. They are talking about what the bid would be or the
- 20 ask would be, right?
- 21 A They are talking about what the price should be set at.
- 22 Q Right. And we heard earlier that the price is the bid
- 23 and the ask, correct?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q And do you know, as you sit here, whether in fact the

- C. VOULGARIS CROSS MR. RIOPELLE 3088 1 times that Mr. Wexler was frustrated that the trading activity 2 at Glendale was not to his liking? From reading this it shows that he's upset that more 3 trades are not occurring. So Glendale is trading -- Ms. Cane 5 is restricting Glendale from trading every day. It seems like 6 she wants more a steady decline. 7 Now, do you recall intercepting or listening to 8 intercepted phone calls between Mr. Wexler and Mr. Discala where they discuss taking the free trading shares of Cubed 9 10 away from Glendale and putting them at BMAC, another broker? 11 I can't recall that conversation between Mr. Wexler and 12 Mr. Discala. If you have a transcript I can refresh my 1.3 recollection. 14 Okay. 15 I know that --16 Let me show you --17 MR. RIOPELLE: I just have a couple more questions 18 in this area, but I have a good half hour or more. I think we 19 should take lunch when I tie this off, if I may make that 20 suggestion? 21 THE COURT: I would accept your suggestion. 22 working off your last suggestion, which said you'll be pulling 23 into the last station right around now.
- MR. RIOPELLE: Judge, like most lawyers, it was
 hyperbole and inaccurate. We'll have to go on the warning.

C. VOULGARIS - CROSS - MR. RIOPELLE 3089 1 THE COURT: Go ahead. 2 BY MR. RIOPELLE: 3 I'm going to show you what I've marked KCCB2. I'm going to direct your attention to this page. I've written an arrow 5 in the margin, and ask you to take a look at that. And see if 6 that refreshes your recollection that Mr. Wexler was 7 frustrated with the way that the trading was being handled at 8 Glendale and wanted to move the account to BMAC. 9 MR. BINI: Your Honor, I am going to object to this. 10 This is a piece of trial testimony it was just handed to the 11 witness for which he was not present for trial testimony. 12 MR. RIOPELLE: I think you can ask the witness to 1.3 look at anything to refresh his recollection. THE COURT: He can refresh his recollection. 14 15 In reviewing the area with the arrow, I mean I can't say 16 that I knew that he was dissatisfied before or he had 17 displeasure prior to reading this. 18 Okay. So you just don't recall as you sit here now 19 whether you knew back in the day that Wexler was frustrated 20 with the trading at Glendale? 2.1 That's correct. I can't recall if I knew that. 22 You can't recall. Can you put that aside?

23 MR. RIOPELLE: Judge, that's the last question in this area. I do have a series of questions that will take us 24 25 I don't want the jury to go too long without for a while.

	PROCEEDINGS 3090
1	eating.
2	THE COURT: Sounds like a good idea, Mr. Riopelle.
3	Ladies and gentlemen, we'll take our luncheon break.
4	I'm going to remind you again of your instructions
5	that you received, don't discuss the case amongst yourselves.
6	Continue to keep an open mind. Don't discuss the case with
7	anyone else. Don't use the lunch room period as an
8	opportunity to do a research of any kind. If you are on a
9	social media platform, please again remember to observe our
10	radio-silence rule.
11	I'm going to ask you to return to the central jury
12	room at around 2:45 and we'll start as close to that time as
13	we can. We'll see you then.
14	(Jury exits.)
15	THE COURT: Special Agent, you can step down.
16	(Whereupon, the witness steps down.)
17	I think it's a good time before lunch to take up the
18	matters that we were going to take up at a break.
19	MR. BINI: Thank you, your Honor. The Government
20	filed on ECF 602 under seal. And we seek to preclude the
21	testimony of Neil Levine because we think it's irrelevant.
22	Before I argue that, I would just ask because I did not hear
23	his name, if defense counsel is not planning to call him I'll
24	move on.

MR. ROSS: We're absolutely not calling Mr. Levine.

3091

1 He will not be a defense once for us.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BINI: Okay. The next topic, your Honor, are the exhibits prepared by the accountant and anticipated witness Haley Eckhart. Ms. Jones is going to argue this portion.

MS. JONES: Your Honor, there are a couple of objections that I have to the material produced by Ms. Eckhart.

First of all, I think this is an egregious violation of Rule 16 to wait until we're at the verge of the close of the case, two days before the testimony, to dump this material on us, on a Saturday when she's supposed to testify on Monday. This material is extensive, it's like 100 schedules. clearly has been working on this for months. So for the claim to be, oh, this came up because Joan Mazella's testimony, it's simply not credible. There are portions of those schedules that I think are irrelevant and inadmissible. It appears that what Ms. Eckhart has been asked to do is to look at the net cash in and out of Discala-related entities relating to both the charge companies, and when it appears he's turning a profit they add in these additional companies that are not part of this case to include those changes loss such as Soul and Vibe, LBAS, HRAA and ISGI, to include those trading analysis just to show trading losses. They are not charged in They don't even show any net investments in those our case.

companies. They show trading losses.

1.3

In addition, there are a couple of schedules in there where the sole purpose of the schedule seems to be to compare the money that Discala made in Code Smart versus the money that a guy named Joe Salvani made in Code Smart, just to compare this guy made more money trading Code Smart than Discala did, relying on blue sheet data, no brokerage account statements. It's completely irrelevant and has nothing to do with the charges in this case.

Finally there are portions of the analysis that do not appear to have a basis and admitted Government exhibits. Again, this is a lot of material that was dumped on us over the weekend. And I've been trying to go through it diligently to try to identify the flaws in the analysis. But for example, for one of the charged group stocks, the Staffing Group, Ms. Eckhart performed an analysis, Mr. Discala loaned the company almost \$800,000. Somehow that should be factored into the -- I don't know what is going on here, but that should be factored into the analysis.

When you look into the detail, approximately half of that loan is from a different company, the Broadsmoore Group, back from 2012 and has no underlying documentation to show that the money was actually paid.

So this is just a lot of stuff to be dumped on us at the last minute, some of which is clearly irrelevant and some

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

of which clearly does not seem to have the support or even belong in whatever kind of analysis she performed.

MR. CHENG: I can address this issue. Ms. Jones and the Government ask us to provide all the 3500 material. We provided a draft copy of the report. We have since condensed that report, which we have also provided. There is no way for us to know what Mazella or even Wexler or any of the witnesses that have testified in the last week two weeks, so while she did prepare a substantially complete report, we intend on condensing that based on testimony.

Mr. Wexler actually did plead that Mr. Discala and Wexler were manipulating other companies such as TSGL, ISGI, LBAS. There are references earlier in this case to Soul, which is why we're including that evidence.

MS. JONES: He didn't plead to those charges, he just has coverage for them -- I'm sorry to interrupt.

MR. ROSS: Judge, in addition, we provided the Government last week, according to your Honor's instruction, that we did have an accounting witness Ms. Eckhart. So they were on notice that we intended or might call Ms. Eckhart. We have made a decision during this time period to call her. There are other witnesses that we did not call. And we're trying to cut it down as many as we can.

Your Honor is aware that we subpoenaed many witnesses. Some of those witnesses we just were not able to

1.3

locate because, we think, that they knew that we wanted to subpoena them and they are just not available. So with respect to this particular witness, we provided the materials as soon as we could. We provided the materials in conjunction with the scope of the testimony that we propose Ms. Eckhart make.

As Mr. Cheng made references to, there are uncharged crimes or uncharged companies in this Indictment or in this case that your Honor has ruled come in under 404(b). There has been testimony that those companies were manipulated and they were manipulated by Mr. Discala. So that put in, that put at issue the accounting information, the accounting evidence, that we would like to present to this jury.

It's my understanding that this evidence is limited.

And that it is limited only to profit and loss. That is my understanding of what Mr. Cheng intends to elicit from Ms. Eckhart.

So I would suggest that this is an extraordinary remedy that the Government is asking your Honor to do. She's an important witness to us. And to completely preclude her testimony would be extraordinary under these circumstances. That's what I have to say.

MR. CHENG: The report includes rebuttal testimony to Mazella, Ferrante and the Government's expert Oremland, and also tracks, she's a forensic accountant, it tracks

Mr. Discala's trading activity as well.

1.3

THE COURT: Anything further?

MS. JONES: Your Honor, again, defense counsel only produces material after I complain and complain several times about where are the exhibits, where are the documents, where is the 3500 material. Clearly this accountant was retained several months ago. There has been no production of engagement letter, no production of any information about how much she's been paid or spent on this, or how much money she's due.

Again, a lot of the schedules and information that they are seeking to introduce relating to trading in companies that are not part of the charged charges in this case are irrelevant. We didn't produce any testimony regarding Discala's profit or loss in, if they want to do the three other stocks here fine, but Soul and Vibe, LBAS, HRAA, not relevant.

MR. CHENG: They were raised in Ms. Eckhart's charts.

THE COURT: They are not coming in, Mr. Cheng. The four targeted companies, if she wants to provide accounting, relevant accounting information with respect to the four charged companies, she certainly will be permitted to do that. To the extent that there are assumptions that she relies on not rooted in evidence already been admitted before the jury,

3096 1 those references are also out. 2 To the extent that these exhibits go beyond, that 3 her report, goes beyond that, she will have to whittle it down 4 and be ready to go. And the Government will have an 5 opportunity to review it. To the extent the Government needs 6 a continuance to the following day, I certainly am prepared to 7 grant that the continuance to give them an opportunity to 8 prepare. MR. CHENG: Your Honor, but Ms. Mazella's charts 9 10 actually list Mr. Discala's profit and losses in HRAA, ISGI 11 and Soul. It references in Goepel's charge as well. To 12 preclude as --1.3 THE COURT: Not providing, we're not going down to have a mini trial on how the profit and losses arrived. 14 MR. CHENG: Are we allowed to references Ms. 15 16 Mazella's charge? 17 THE COURT: Absolutely. If it's in evidence, she 18 can look at it and testify as to it. Not a problem. 19 MR. CHENG: So we can reference --20 THE COURT: Anything that is in evidence. If it's 21 in evidence she can testify as to it, where she's qualified. 22 She couldn't give an opinion in an area that she's not

qualified. She's here as an accountant, forensic accountant. MR. CHENG: The numbers majority of the numbers

23

24

25

relate to Soul, at least relate to evidence that has already

1 been admitted.

1.3

MS. JONES: No, he's talking about taking the bank records that are in evidence then just putting in her analysis of the bank records.

THE COURT: I was referring to the exhibits that Ms.

Mazella used in her forensic, in her testimony. Any of the exhibits that she used, obviously your witness can use those exhibits.

MR. BINI: Our next topic is expert testimony, and with respect to David Parker.

THE COURT: I thought he wasn't testifying.

MR. ROSS: No, no, that's Neil Levine. Neil Levine is not testifying, Judge. But David Parker and Eric Engstrom are testifying. We do not intend to elicit expert testimony from either witness. We discuss closed 3500 material in abundance of caution, and but we do not intend to elicit any expert testimony either from Mr. Parker --

THE COURT: What evidence do you intend to elicit?

MR. ROSS: Mr. Parker was hired to do due diligence
on Cubed. So he's going to testify about his efforts in that
area and what he did. When and how and why. He's not going
to give an expert opinion about anything. It is simply a fact
witness. And it is relevant that Mr. Discala and Omniview
undertook that effort in order to make sure that this was a
real company, and that's relevant. That's relevant to this

PROCEEDINGS 3098 1 case. And with respect to Mr. Engstrom. 2 THE COURT: Why don't we stop there. Mr. Bini? 3 MR. BINI: If Mr. Parker is not going to testify as 4 to valuation, the Government doesn't have a problem with him 5 testifying regarding --THE COURT: As to what he did. 6 7 MR. BINI: Yes. The issue is there was an Excel 8 spreadsheet, if they are not seeking to put that in, it had 9 estimates regarding the business for Cubed, which the 10 Government believes goes to valuation, we think this is -- if 11 they were seeking to put that in, we would object to that. 12 Based on what has been stated on the record, the Government 1.3 doesn't object to that at this time. 14 MR. ROSS: Judge, the same is true about Eric 15 Engstrom. Mr. Engstrom was retained, has a background in 16 technology. He's simply going to testify about what he did 17 and that was to do due diligence on the technology that was 18 available at Cubed. That's it. He's not going to give expert 19 testimony. 20 MS. JONES: As long as they are not planning on 21 testifying as to their opinion as to what the value of the 22 company was. 23

For example, neither -- I don't know about Mr.

Parker -- Mr. Engstrom, his background is specialized in working for technology companies. It's personal to his own

24

that's what is the object of the testimony, as I understand it, as opposed to the conclusion.

MR. ROSS: Simply --

23

24

Rivka Teich CSR, RPR, RMR Official Court Reporter

wanted to place on the record. As, your Honor, knows we

subpoenaed a lot of witnesses here. And we've done -- and

24

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

we've paired the number of witnesses down substantially. At this point we have three witnesses ready to go. And their testimony will be presented.

We had intended to call a man by the name of Diego Roca. We've given the Government notice that we intended to call Mr. Roca. Mr. Roca is the former Chief Financial Officer at Code Smart. We would proffer that he could testify about Mr. Discala's efforts at refinancing Code Smart.

We spoke to him. He had relevant testimony to give. But over the last few days when we've tried to get in touch with him about his testimony here, he's not in touch with us at all. I left a message for him saying that he was under subpoena. That under 17G that we can ask, your Honor, to hold him in contempt.

And I don't know, the Government has with respect to another potential witness that we gave notice of a man called Paul Lane, who appeared on one of the transcripts and wiretap conversations that they wanted. And I understand this, that they wanted to know whether or not he had a lawyer. They viewed him as an unindicted co-conspirator. I know your Honor does not want to have invocations on the witness stand, that's just not, as you said, going to happen. It's not proper.

But by the same token, the Government's efforts in this area, and I don't know whether they went out and spoke to Mr. Roca, he's an important witness to us and now he doesn't

PROCEEDINGS

appear to be available. So any Government efforts at chilling our witnesses I simply wanted to put on the record for, your Honor, to understand and put, your Honor, on notice about that.

Indeed just during this morning's testimony we discovered, and I now have a telephone number for Dan Walsh, who's name has come up in connection with this case and this evidence. And I did tell, your Honor, that it was a ongoing effort that we would have to try to reach witnesses. I don't know whether we'll decide to call him. I did want to let your Honor know that we were finally able to reach what we believe may be an important witness to our defense.

MS. JONES: Your Honor, just to be clear, the Government has not reached out to Mr. Roca. We have not reached out to any of the defense witnesses. We are not making any attempts to interfere with their defense case. Frankly, this case has been going on, we're on our fifth week, they should be ready, they should be ready to go.

THE COURT: I totally agree with that.

MS. JONES: Regarding Ms. Eckhart, if the issue is redacting certain portions of the report, the Government would be willing to just have them cover it up and prepare to move forward today. Then we could they could make it look nice by the time we give it to the jury. If all it is is just an issue of covering up the portions that are irrelevant, we want

1 to move forward.

THE COURT: That would make even better sense.

Mr. Cheng1.

3

4

5

6

9

MR. CHENG: That's fine with us.

THE COURT: That's fine with them too.

MS. JONES: Great.

7 THE COURT: Then you all can, again, with redaction

8 I have a very basic rule, allow counsel to work it out amongst

themselves. Where there is a loggerhead, I break the tie.

10 MR. CHENG: It would be impossible to redact the

11 total if we're computing including all the companies. We'll

12 leave the total out there, but redact the companies for the

13 companies.

14 MS. JONES: If the math is wrong, it should be

15 redacted.

16 THE COURT: There are a million ways to redact

17 things, Mr. Cheng. You have plenty of time to reassemble the

18 document.

MR. CHENG: If the Government is asking us to

20 recompute the numbers then we would have to need time to

21 prepare the new computations for the schedules it can't just

22 be redacted.

THE COURT: I don't know if, they are, how it works.

24 If you're eliminating names, the column, and that column is

25 used to compute this column.

Case 1:	14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 100 of 243 PageID #: 5938
	PROCEEDINGS 3104
1	MR. CHENG: They are all independent.
2	THE COURT: If they are all independent, once
3	eliminate it, it doesn't matter.
4	MR. CHENG: There are certain totals that would
5	include the numbers
6	THE COURT: But to the extent that the mechanic of
7	doing the document would probably be more time consuming as
8	long as long as there is an understanding of what areas of
9	inquiry are appropriate, that seems to be a much larger
10	process in turning that around. Then reassembling the
11	document after the testimony.
12	MR. CHENG: Very well.
13	MR. BINI: Thank you.
14	MS. JONES: Thank you.
15	MR. ROSS: Thank you.
16	THE COURT: Anything else?
17	MS. JONES: Your Honor, I had circulated among the
18	parties the redacted Indictment, which removed the other
19	co-defendants and removed Count Five.
20	THE COURT: You can. I'll tell you why it's not a
21	big deal, because I never send the Indictment in any way.
22	MS. JONES: Oh, okay.

THE COURT: It's restated in the charge, the verdict sheet will be renumbered to reflect the elimination of Count Five.

25

23

1 MR. BINI: Thank you, Judge.

1.3

THE COURT: Let me, we're at that stage of while we're here, we can do it formally after the Government rests or not, you tell me. I'll let defense counsel do it now or after the Government formally rests, that is to make an inquiry to Mr. Discala and Ms. Cane as to whether or not they are going to exercise their rights to, or exercise their right to take the stand.

MR. ROSS: Your Honor, I think we would like to wait until after the Government formally rests.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. ROSS: We are still in the process of making that decision. I don't think that we have formally made that decision yet. We reserve our right. If Mr. Discala wishes to take the stand in his own defense, that we not be bound by any sort of representation right after the Government rests. We have witnesses to put on. And at this stage I think it would be premature to get a commitment one way or the other from Mr. Discala until we hear our defense witnesses.

THE COURT: You can wait until the end. Obviously with the case with Ms. Cane, we'll soon be on defendant Cane's last witness.

MR. RIOPELLE: Your Honor, ultimately this decision is her's to make, but I do not believe she will be testifying in the defense case. I'll confirm that over lunch.

1 THE COURT: What I mean, I'm going to ask them 2 personally in an allocution whatever their decision is. 3 MR. RIOPELLE: I will let her know that the Court 4 intends to proceed in that way. I will say that I would like 5 to preserve Ms. Cane's right to testify in a rebuttal case if 6 Mr. Discala does testify and says something that I think must 7 be rebutted by her. But I do not, it is not my present 8 intention to encourage her to take the witness stand in her 9 defense. 10 THE COURT: And I think to the extent that things 11 change, Mr. Riopelle, I don't have a problem with that. 12 Particularly, it remains the right of the individual 1.3 defendant. And to the extent that she whispers in your ear 14 and says, Tell the Judge I change my mind, please. 15 MR. RIOPELLE: I will not conceal that fact. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Obviously it's her right, as it 17 is Mr. Discala's. 18 MR. RIOPELLE: Understood, your Honor. I just 19 wanted to make the record clear. 20 THE COURT: A lot of times we talk about the right 21 to remain silent; there is also a right to take the stand. 22 MR. RIOPELLE: Sure, sure. 23 THE COURT: And equally important under the Fifth 24 Amendment. 25 MR. RIOPELLE: Understood, your Honor.

I can't -- I don't know if there was a significant

VOULGARIS - CROSS - RIOPELLE

- 1 | interest in buying the stock.
- 2 What I can tell basically from the investigation
- 3 somebody that was outside the control of at Glendale made a
- 4 significant purchase that was not within the parameters of
- 5 What Ms. Cane and Mr. Discala wanted.
- 6 Q So it's your testimony that the defendants lost control
- 7 of the price of the stock, at least for a time on that day.
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q And we listened to a phone call during your direction
- 10 examination, at least one in which my client and Mr. Discala
- 11 discussed the fact that there appeared to be activity in the
- 12 stock that they didn't understand, correct?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q And indeed my client at one point expressed the view that
- 15 | she didn't know what had happened, correct?
- 16 A At one point, yes.
- 17 Q And then you told us that, and we heard that there was
- 18 talk on the wire about making the price land at \$6.35,
- 19 correct?
- 20 A Yes.
- 21 | Q It's a fact, isn't it, the stock price of Cubed at the
- 22 end of May 23rd did not land at \$6.35?
- 23 A It was around there. If you show me that document that
- 24 shows the stock price for the day.
- 25 Q Let me ask you this: Do you recall that the stock price,

VOULGARIS - CROSS - RIOPELLE

- 1 and we saw some of the documents when Mr. Bini was asking the
- 2 question I just want to sort of speed through it, do you
- 3 | recall that the price at the end of the day was \$6.30?
- 4 A Yes, I believe so.
- 5 Q And I think we agree that's close to 6.35, correct?
- 6 A It's within 5 cents.
- 7 Q Okay. But it's not \$6.35.
- 8 A No.
- 9 Q So to the extent you made any findings they were that the
- 10 defendants could not control the price of the stock well
- 11 enough to make it land at \$6.35, correct?
- 12 A I can't come to that conclusion. There were a lot of
- different factors that come into it. The stock price
- 14 skyrocketed above \$7 a share on that day.
- And as they stated in the telephone calls, they were
- 16 able to correct the price back downwards to where they wanted
- 17 | it or within a range of where they wanted it.
- 18 Q They wanted it at \$6.35, correct?
- 19 A At least one party mentioned that.
- 20 Q That's what we heard on the telephone call we all
- 21 listened to in court, correct?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q But they were not able to make it land at \$6.35; isn't
- 24 | that right?
- 25 A Not exactly.

Q Yes, let me show you a series of text messages, which

If you could refresh my recollection on what I saw.

24

- 20 A As far as I can recall, that's correct.
- 21 Q Now, is Cubed what you would characterize as a
- 22 thinly-traded stock?
- 23 A Yes.
- 24 Q And that's a stock that typically trades a few thousand
- 25 shares in a day? Or even less.

- 1 A Yes. I mean you want me to refer to the records?
- 2 Q Or just give me a sense of what you mean by a
- 3 "thinly-traded stock," so I know we're talking about the same
- 4 thing.
- 5 A I believe the Cubed they traded only a couple hundred
- 6 shares to a couple thousand shares a day.
- 7 Q Okay. And with a thinly-traded stock like that, there is
- 8 always a possibility that the price can spike up as it did on
- 9 May 23rd, correct?
- 10 A I suppose, yeah, there is that possibility.
- 11 Q But we've established that -- and there's also the
- 12 possibility in a thinly-traded stock that sales of shares can
- 13 | cause the price to decline, correct?
- 14 A That is a possibility as well.
- 15 Q Because the price of a stock is set based upon how many
- 16 buyers and how many sellers there are at any given time,
- 17 correct?
- 18 A Most of other factors, yes.
- 19 Q The supply and demand for a particular stock are an
- 20 important influence on its price, correct?
- 21 A I'd say so, yes.
- 22 Q Now, but after June 30th, as we've established, there was
- 23 no trading of any kind in the Ben-Bassat account at Glendale,
- 24 correct?
- 25 A Yes.

or whatever they're called, to be certain. But as you sit

here now, you know there were trades in that three-week

23

24

25

period, correct?

- 1 A Yes.
- 2 Q And those trades, because the few remained of
- 3 | thinly-traded stock during that three-week period; did it not?
- 4 A Without looking at the records rightly, I can just assume
- 5 that it was still thinly trading, yes.
- 6 Q And those trades during that three-week period could
- 7 | influence the price of Cubed, correct?
- 8 A Correct.
- 9 Q But the Ben-Bassat account did not trade during that
- 10 period.
- 11 A No, it didn't.
- 12 Q Now, by the way, even when the Ben-Bassat account was
- 13 trading from late April to the end of June 2014, it is a fact,
- 14 is it not, that the Ben-Bassat account was not trading every
- 15 day?
- 16 A Um, from the trade confirms, yes, that's correct. It was
- 17 not trading every day.
- 18 Q And there were sometimes days at a time where there was
- 19 no trade out of the Ben-Bassat account, correct?
- 20 A Without reviewing the records, I can't tell you how many
- 21 days went by.
- 22 Q Okay. Let me see if I can help.
- I'd like to show you what's been previously marked
- in evidence as Government's Exhibit 196-13.
- And, sir, just to orient you, you've never seen this

at some of the backup data, I wouldn't be able to tell you

It appears to be that. I don't know -- without looking

there's a sale on June 13th and then no other sale until

June 23rd. The chart tells us that, right?

22

23

24

- 1 including Mr. Azrak, Mr. Bell, Mr. Wexler, et cetera, they are
- 2 neither buy or sell that day, correct?
- 3 A Based on this chart, that's correct.
- 4 Q Correct. And so if the chart is correct, there's just no
- 5 chance there was a matched order that day, correct?
- 6 A I mean I'd have to look at the underlying records.
- 7 Q I understand. But looking --
- 8 A Based on this.
- 9 O Correct.
- 10 A That's correct.
- 11 Q And the same would be true, by the way, at the end where
- 12 everybody's selling, right?
- 13 A It appears. I can't say again definitively not looking
- 14 at the underlying records.
- 15 Q Right. You didn't make this chart and you'd have to
- 16 check the records, correct, to be sure?
- 17 A That's correct.
- 18 Q But if the chart indicates that everybody is selling from
- 19 about, I want to say June 13th, until the last sale failed by
- 20 the Ben-Bassat account on the 30th, correct?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q And so there doesn't appear -- if the chart is correct,
- 23 there doesn't appear to be any evidence of a matched order or
- 24 a wash sale during that last two or three weeks, correct?
- 25 A That's correct. Based on the chart.

3122

1 | earlier today, on June 12th, 2014, in which Mr. Josephberg

- 2 asked Mr. Discala what's going on with CRPT?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q That one you remember. Okay.
- 5 Do you know, as you sit here now, whether there was
- any trade in the Ben-Bassat account on June 12th, 2014?
- 7 A Without checking the records, I can't make that. I'm
- 8 unaware.
- 9 Q Okay. But it turns out we can do that, because there
- 10 | would be a confirm if there was a trade, right?
- 11 A I assume so, yes.
- 12 Q And we have the confirms, correct? That was Government's
- 13 Exhibit 149-4, right?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q And if we go through them, they're organized by date.
- 16 And you can see that, for example, this one is in May. So if
- 17 | we just flip through. Okay, here we go.
- 18 You can see June 6th. There's June 9th, three days
- 19 later. There's a trade on June 11th, a couple days after
- 20 that. No trade on June 10th, I guess. And then the next
- 21 trade is June 13th, 2014.
- So insofar as the confirms can tell us anything,
- 23 they tell us that there was no trade in the Ben-Bassat account
- 24 on that day, June 12th, that we heard about earlier today,
- 25 correct?

Above \$6 a share.

Yes.

of 2014?

22

23

2.4

25

What was the stock trading at in and around May and June

Case 1:	14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 123 of 243 PageID #: 5961
	VOULGARIS - REDIRECT - BINI 3127
1	Q So would those shares have been worth more than \$150,000?
2	A Yes.
3	Q That were received for only \$6,000?
4	A Yes.
5	MR. BINI: Mr. Riopelle asked you some questions
6	regarding text messages that I wanted to briefly go through.
7	If we can show on the screen and so, William, I ask
8	to use the overhead computer. If we could show 129-92.
9	(Exhibit published.)
10	MR. BINI: If you can blow up the back.
11	Q And without going through all the text messages on your
12	direct examination, did you testify regarding certain text
13	messages involving Kyleen Cane and Northwest Resources?
14	A Yes.
15	Q And if we can go to the next page of this.
16	Okay, if we can go to 129-93.
17	(Exhibit published.)
18	And what's the date of this text message?
19	A June 21st, 2013.
20	Q And who are the parties to this text message?
21	A Joe Laxague and Kyleen Cane.
22	Q If we go to the second page rather let's go to 129-94,
23	another one of these messages.
24	(Exhibit published.)
25	Do you see where the text message on June 26th, at

the ability of or -- excuse me, strike that.

Mr. Riopelle asked you some questions regarding whether

23

24

25

shares into the market.

25

something new.

Case 1:14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 131 of 243 PageID #: 5969				
	VOULGARIS - RECROSS - RIOPELLE 3135			
1	A No.			
2	Q And so far as you know, George Castillo at Glendale			
3	Securities never been arrested, correct?			
4	MR. BINI: Objection, Your Honor.			
5	THE COURT: Sustained.			
6	Q And same is true of Hunter Adams, correct?			
7	MR. BINI: Objection, Your Honor.			
8	THE COURT: You're asking if he got an arrest			
9	warrant?			
10	Q Did you ever seek an arrest warrant			
11	MR. BINI: Outside the scope. And this was already			
12	deal with on his cross.			
13	THE COURT: Yes, it is outside the scope of the			
14	redirect.			
15	MR. RIOPELLE: Then I will withdraw the question,			
16	Your Honor.			
17	Thank you, Special Agent Voulgaris, I know you have			
18	some place to go. God speed.			
19	THE COURT: Thank you.			
20	I assume, Mr. Bini, there is no redirect.			
21	MR. BINI: There is not, Your Honor. Thank you.			
22	THE COURT: Special Agent Voulgaris, thank you very			
23	much. You are excused.			
24	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.			
25	(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)			

PROCEEDINGS 3136

1 THE COURT: Ms. Jones.

1.3

MS. JONES: Your Honor, the government rests.

THE COURT: The government rests?

MS. JONES: Yes.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as you will recall, once you start harkening back to the instructions you received way began at the beginning of trial, I would refer to these various building blocks. Well, we've come to one those end of the building block. The government has rested.

As you'll recall, it's not the end of the case by any stretch of the imagination, it's just we reached a milestone.

Now, sometimes when we reach milestones, the Court has to get reconfigured a bit on legal issues that come up that don't involve the jury, and it's around the midafternoon break at any rate, so we're going to take the break.

We're going to have to address some legal issues, so we'll make the break a little longer so that other personnel can get the benefit that you're going to get. So let's assume that will be 20 to 25 minutes. We'll send you back to the jury room where you can relax there.

The fact that you get a little longer break doesn't mean any of the rules change. Continue to keep an open mind and do not discuss the case amongst yourselves or with anyone else you may run into in the back.

Case 1:	14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 133 of 243 Page	HD #: 5971
	PROCEEDINGS	3137
1	We'll come and get you as soon as we can.	
2	(Jury exits the courtroom.)	
3	(Continued on next page.)	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	THE COURT: The motions at the close of the
2	Government's case in chief.
3	MR. ROSS: Judge, I move that the Government's case
4	is insufficient for your Honor to send to the jury and I'd ask
5	it be dismissed.
6	MR. RIOPELLE: On behalf of Ms. Cane, I move under
7	Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 29 for a dismissal of the
8	case for insufficiency of evidence, particularly on the issue
9	of intent.
10	THE COURT: Does the Government wish to make a
11	record on their side?
12	MS. JONES: Your Honor, we believe that viewing the
13	evidence in the light most favorable to the Government and
14	drawing all inferences in our favor, there is more than enough
15	evidence to submit this case to the jury.
16	THE COURT: The Court will reserve decision at the
17	close of the Government's case in chief.
18	Mr. Riopelle, you're going to be up first?
19	MR. RIOPELLE: Yes. I have a very brief stipulation
20	to read and then a very brief witness and we, too, will rest.
21	THE COURT: I know based on our earlier conversation
22	Mr. Ross wants to defer on this, but since we are almost at
23	the close of Ms. Cane's case
24	I understand from you, Mr. Riopelle, that at this
25	time, though pending what may develop on Mr. Discala's case,

PROCEEDINGS

3139

1 it is Ms. Cane's intention to exercise her right to remain 2 silent. 3 MR. RIOPELLE: That is my understanding, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: Ms. Cane, as you probably heard me say 5 earlier on, this is such an important right. While we certainly believe that the attorneys will always represent to 6 7 the Court what their client has decided, it's so important 8 that I ask personally a couple of questions. 9 The first and most important thing that you must 10 understand is you have a right not only to remain silent but 11 also have the right to take the witness stand and testify in 12 your own defense. The other thing, obviously, under the Sixth 13 Amendment, you also have a right to have competent counsel 14 represent you. 15 So the first question is: Have you had a chance to 16 thoroughly discuss this decision of whether to remain silent 17 or to take the stand with your attorney? 18 DEFENDANT CANE: Yes. 19 MR. RIOPELLE: She has terrible laryngitis. 20 DEFENDANT CANE: Sorry. 21 THE COURT: I can hear her. If I can't, I'll yell 22 back at her. 23 And on the basis of your discussions and advice with your counsel, have you reached a decision as to whether or not 24

you will remain silent or take the stand?

1 DEFENDANT CANE: I'll remain silent.

2 MR. RIOPELLE: She said she'll remain silent.

3 She may have no other option.

THE COURT: And that's not because you have laryngitis.

DEFENDANT CANE: That's correct.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Now Mr. Discala, I'll be asking you the same question, so you've gotten a preview. In deference to Mr. Ross' choice, I will wait towards the end of your case before I ask you that.

DEFENDANT DISCALA: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there anything else we need to attend to before we take our little break and come back?

MR. ROSS: The only thing for us is that Mr. Parker has a flight later on in the day. I don't think there's going to be any problem, we'll put him on first to make sure he makes his flight.

THE COURT: Okay. Aside from the days I've forecasted in advance we'd be leaving early, we haven't left too early. So, we'll stay until we have to.

MS. JONES: Your Honor, I just wanted to ask a procedural question.

Are we planning on sitting on Friday? We hope so, but we just wanted to confirm.

PROCEEDINGS

1		
1	THE COURT: The short answer is if for some reason	
2	we're still taking testimony, the answer would be no. And	
3	under those circumstances, we will not be sitting Friday,	
4	Monday, and Tuesday.	
5	MS. JONES: Okay.	
6	THE COURT: If, in fact, the jury has gotten the	
7	case, we will allow deliberations to continue on Friday.	
8	MS. JONES: Okay. Great.	
9	MR. RIOPELLE: And will deliberations then continue	
10	Monday and Tuesday?	
11	THE COURT: No, not in my absence.	
12	MR. RIOPELLE: Fair enough.	
13	I am worried about what happens if we start with	
14	summations on Thursday and get the first couple in. Are we	
15	going to go break things up in that way, if we have to, or try	
16	to just move it over?	
17	THE COURT: Today is Monday. So, I don't know how	
18	long we're going. I'm expecting that we will start summations	
19	sometime tomorrow unless there's an exceedingly long witness	
20	that I am unaware of.	
21	MR. RIOPELLE: Okay. Tomorrow or Wednesday sounds	
22	sensible to me, like it could happen, but life is	
23	unpredictable.	
24	THE COURT: Notwithstanding getting Mr. Parker on,	
25	it is still our plan to have the charge conference this	

Case 1:14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 138 of 243 PageID #: 5976 PROCEEDINGS 3142 1 evening. 2 MR. RIOPELLE: Yes. I have my notes and am ready to 3 go on that, Judge. THE COURT: So, that will be out of the way. 4 5 So we'll be wherever Mr. Ross is with his witnesses. 6 And as I understand it at this point, we're not anticipating a 7 rebuttal case, but, of course, the Government can't answer 8 that until Mr. Discala's case is finished. 9 MS. JONES: That's correct, your Honor. We're not 10 anticipating it, but we'll see. 11 THE COURT: But it could be. 12 So, if, in fact, we don't have a rebuttal case and Mr. Ross' witness list is pared down to where he thinks it is, 1.3 14 I would assume we will be reaching summations tomorrow. 15 MS. JONES: Great. 16 THE COURT: And we'll go from there. 17 And what I'll ask you and you can keep in mind and 18 think about, at some point during the charge conference or at 19 the end of the charge conference I'll ask you to give us a 20 ballpark on how long your summations are. 21

MR. ROSS: That's fine, Judge.

THE COURT: Just start to think in those terms. will see you in about fifteen.

MR. RIOPELLE: Thank you, your Honor.

(Recess taken.)

22

23

24

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Counsel for both sides are present, including Defendants.

MR. HEIN: I wanted to raise one point prior to Mr. Riopelle's witness Mr. Baker testifying.

We just wanted to ensure that Mr. Riopelle does not elicit any instances of specific good conduct or any hearsay from his client stated to Mr. Baker.

MR. RIOPELLE: I do not intend to elicit that evidence, your Honor. And he's been prepared to respond to appropriate questions, so I don't think that will be a problem.

THE COURT: Following the methodology we used last week.

MR. RIOPELLE: Yes. I suspect Mr. Hein will object vociferously if we stray, which we do not intend to do, but life being what it is...

THE COURT: That being the case, we can get the jury.

MR. RIOPELLE: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. HEIN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: You're welcome.

22 As the wise old carpenter once told, Measure twice,

24 (Jury enters.)

cut once.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

25

THE COURT: Be seated, please.

Proceedings	Proceed	ings
-------------	---------	------

Counsel will stipulate that the jury is present and properly seated?

MS. JONES: Yes, your Honor.

MR. ROSS: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RIOPELLE: So stipulated, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome back.

We're ready to resume this session. As you know, the Government has rested. Now we're shifting to the defense case. I will remind you of a couple of things I told you last week.

Remember via accommodation — the attorneys working with each other, trying to make the case most efficient for all concerned, especially you, the jury — we began to hear Ms. Cane's case last week when a couple of witnesses testified. I'll remind you what I said at that time.

Defendants are not required to produce any evidence, none whatsoever. And they certainly are not required to take the stand. And if they do offer evidence in the form of testimony or documents, they're still not required to take the stand. And if a defendant chooses not to take the stand, a jury may draw absolutely no inference whatsoever from that decision.

So, with that, we now rejoin Ms. Cane's defense case and ask Mr. Riopelle if he has another witness.

OCR

MR. RIOPELLE: I do, your Honor.

RPR

Proceedings

And I think the jury will be relieved to know that it is a brief witness and our last witness. But because I don't want to make them completely happy, I do have a short stipulation to read before we get to that witness. So, we'll start with the stipulation.

THE COURT: Very good.

MR. RIOPELLE: Which reads as follows: It is hereby stipulated and agreed by and between the undersigned parties that Zachary Cundiff, Mr. Cundiff, is employed by Wells Fargo Bank, North America, herein after "Wells Fargo," in the legal order processing department and is qualified to certify the authenticity of business records of Wells Fargo and to testify as a custodian of Wells Fargo's records.

In the course of his employment and in response to a subpoena, Mr. Cundiff searched the records of Wells Fargo to retrieve Wells Fargo's records relating to bank accounts maintained by Cane Clark, LLP, Brian R. Clark, and Kyleen Cane at Wells Fargo.

Mr. Cundiff's search of Wells Fargo's records found no reports of suspicious activity filed by Wells Fargo with the federal government in connection with the Wells Fargo accounts maintained by Cane Clark, LLP, Brian R. Clark, and Kyleen Cane.

This stipulation marked, KC-ST-1 is admissible in evidence at trial and it is dated April 24, 2018, and signed

RPR

BAKER - DIRECT - RIOPELLE

3147

1 (Witness takes the witness stand.)

DAVID BAKER,

- 3 called by the defense, having been first duly sworn,
- 4 was examined and testified as follows:
- 5 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 6 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 7 BY MR. RIOPELLE:
- 8 Q Mr. Baker, where do you live?
- 9 A Las Vegas, Nevada.
- 10 Q And have you traveled here today to testify in this case?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q Can you describe your education for us, sir?
- 13 A Sure. I have an undergraduate degree in political
- 14 science and a law degree from Golden Gate University.
- 15 Q And when did you obtain your law degree from Golden Gate
- 16 University?
- 17 A I believe 1994.
- 18 Q And what industry have you worked in since that time?
- 19 A The financial markets almost the entire time, less three
- 20 and a half years in self-storage.
- 21 O During your travels, did you ever work as an intern with
- 22 the Securities and Exchange Commission?
- 23 A Yes, during my second year of law school for the Division
- of Enforcement under Bob Singletary and then the Division of
- 25 Corporation Finance for a summer.

BAKER - DIRECT - RIOPELLE

3148

Q And can you describe for the jury the types of work that you have done in the securities industry?

A Sure. After graduating from law school, initially I was a broker, then I was a hedge fund manager. I've been a hedge fund manager for two different funds and recently starting my third fund. I've been an investment banker conducting alternative public transactions, I've been a proprietary trader here in New York for First New York Securities. So, a

variety of different securities-related roles throughout my entire career.

I've authored two patents issued by the Patent
Trademark Office in connection with group and sector rotation,
and they were the basis of a company that was eventually a few
years ago acquired by Fact Set Data Systems, a large New York
information company.

- Q Was there ever a point in time when you worked at Merrill Lynch?
- A Yes, 1992, I believe -- it's been a long time -- for three years at the 580 California Street office, which now I understand has moved across the street to 600 California.
- 21 Q When you say California Street --
- 22 A In San Francisco, I apologize.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- Q And what were you doing at Merrill Lynch during that time?
 - A I was a retail broker before leaving and starting my

BAKER - DIRECT - RIOPELLE 3149

- 1 first hedge fund.
- 2 Q Did you start your first hedge fund after leaving Merrill
- 3 Lynch?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q And approximately when was that?
- 6 A 1994.
- 7 Q Now, what sorts of investments did the hedge funds you've
- 8 described make?
- 9 A Small cap and micro capitalization companies. So, market
- 10 capitalizations initially back then from --
- 11 MR. HEIN: Objection, your Honor, relevance.
- MR. RIOPELLE: It goes to experience with my client.
- 13 THE COURT: Briefly.
- 14 Q Briefly.
- 15 A Investing in small and micro cap companies from
- 16 10 million to, let's say, 200 million.
- 17 Q And have you also from time to time worked as a
- 18 consultant to small or micro cap companies?
- 19 A Yes. For many years.
- 20 Q And did your role include helping them to raise capital?
- 21 A Yes, originate transaction, structure the capitalization,
- 22 introduce them to capital, et cetera.
- 23 Q And did some of those transactions involve something
- called a "reverse merger"?
- 25 A Yes.

BAKER - DIRECT - RIOPELLE

3150

1 Q And can you very briefly describe what a reverse merger

2 is?

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

A A reference merger is a merger --

MR. HEIN: Objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Again, just for background purposes?

MR. RIOPELLE: Yes.

A A merger whereby an acquiring company forms a subsidiary company, the subsidiary company then acquires the target company, and then after acquiring the target company the

10 subsidiary is absorbed by the target company.

And it's done instead of direct merger because, number one, there's only one shareholder in the subsidiary and, number two, it allows acquisitions sometimes whereby the acquisition can be made where it normally wouldn't be able to be made because of nontransferable assets or contracts in the target company.

- Q With that background, did there come a time when you met my client, Kyleen Cane?
- 19 A Yes.
- Q Mr. Baker, when was it that you met Kyleen Cane,
- 21 approximately?
- 22 A 2005.
- 23 Q How is it that you met my client, Kyleen Cane?
- 24 A We were working on a transaction for a company called
- 25 Handheld Entertainment and she become issuers' counsel.

BAKER - DIRECT - RIOPELLE

- 1 Q And have you worked with her in other transactions over
- 2 the years?
- 3 A Yes, maybe fifteen transactions, plus or minus.
- 4 Q And can you tell us the sorts of transactions that you
- 5 have worked with Ms. Cane on?
- 6 A Sure. Reverse reference mergers and other alternative
- 7 | going-public transactions.
- 8 Q And did they require you to do intensive work with her?
- 9 A Yes, frequently. Sometimes daily, even.
- 10 Q And during the time that you were involved professionally
- 11 with Ms. Cane, did you have an opportunity to observe her
- 12 behavior as an attorney?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q And was she ever an attorney -- who did she represent in
- 15 the deals that you worked with her on?
- 16 A Only the issuers, only the companies themselves. Not me,
- 17 | not other people; the company itself.
- 18 Q Do you remain friendly with her today?
- 19 A Very. She's become a lifelong friend.
- 20 Q And do you continue to see her socially from time to
- 21 time?
- 22 A Yes.
- 23 Q About how often do you see Ms. Cane socially?
- 24 A Sometimes weekly, sometimes monthly. Depends on our
- 25 travel schedules.

BAKER - CROSS - HEIN

- 1 Q Now, based on your experience with Ms. Cane
- 2 professionally, do you have an opinion concerning her honesty
- 3 | and integrity as a professional?
- 4 A Yes.
- 5 Q Can you tell the jury what that opinion is?
- 6 A She's the most honest, ethical, high-integrity person
- 7 | that I've ever met. She's also the most generous and cares
- 8 about everybody.
- 9 MR. RIOPELLE: Thank you. I have no further
- 10 questions at this time.
- 11 THE COURT: Mr. Hein, do you have any cross?
- MR. HEIN: Yes, your Honor.
- 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- 15 BY MR. HEIN:
- 16 Q Mr. Baker, you testified that you have a close
- 17 relationship with Ms. Cane; is that right?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q Is it fair to say that you wouldn't want to see her get
- 20 in trouble? Is that right?
- 21 A Absolutely.
- 22 Q And you're here to help her?
- 23 A I am.
- 24 Q Mr. Baker, you didn't have any involvement with a company
- 25 called Cubed, correct?

LAM OCR RPR

MR. ROSS: Yes, your Honor. Mr. Discala will call

Mr. Ross, does Mr. Discala have a case?

24

case 1.	BAKER - CROSS - HEIN 3154
1	David Parker to the witness stand. Let me just go get him,
2	and Mr. Shroyer will do the direct.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MR. SHROYER: Your Honor, Mr. Discala calls David
5	parker.
6	(Witness sworn.)
7	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please state your first and
8	last name and spell it for the record.
9	THE WITNESS: David Parker, P-A-R-K-E-R.
10	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you. Have a seat.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Shroyer, you may inquire.
12	MR. SHROYER: Thank you, your Honor.
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

A I retired as a career police officer and I converted over and started working in marketing and internet with our family

24

- 1 business.
- 2 Q I apologize, do I have it right, then, that you had a
- 3 career as a police officer and after you retired from that you
- 4 took courses in college?
- 5 A I began college about two years -- two or three years
- 6 before I retired and started working part-time for our family
- 7 business, which they had a marketing business.
- 8 Q Okay. Before you went into the marketing business, what
- 9 was your career up to that point?
- 10 A Up to the marketing business?
- 11 Q Before you got into marketing, what did you do?
- 12 A I was a police officer in Indianapolis for 20 years.
- 13 Q Can you tell me about the marketing company you're
- 14 involved with now?
- 15 A The marketing company I'm involved with now, I have a
- 16 consultancy called Thinks Network, which is a derivative of
- 17 our family business, which was Creative Direction out of
- 18 Indianapolis. The Thinks Network consultancy, which I do,
- 19 handles the one-on-one interactions with people to help them
- 20 prepare things for their marketing efforts.
- 21 Q So, do I have it right that it's a marketing consulting
- 22 company?
- 23 A Yes, sir.
- 24 Q Are there any other services that Thinks Consulting
- 25 provides?

- 2 start-ups, usually when they have to do with technology.
- 3 Q Sir, in your business dealings with Thinks Consulting,
- 4 did you ever meet an individual named Max Khan?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q About when?
- 7 A Probably about 2010, something like that.
- 8 Q And what kind of work did you do, if any, for Mr. Khan?
- 9 A For Mr. Khan, I would typically go in and do what I call
- 10 a due diligence, which I don't think that really is the
- 11 appropriate term but it's what I call it. I know due
- diligence has another meaning in the business world, but I
- would go in and I would research start-up companies that had a
- 14 | technical aspect to them and issue a report to him on what I
- 15 found.
- 16 Q And to your knowledge, did Mr. Khan have a relationship
- 17 | with an Abraxas Discala?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q And I'd like to turn now to a company called Cubed. Are
- 20 you familiar with that company?
- 21 A Yes, I am.
- 22 Q And when did you become familiar with it?
- 23 A I received a phone call from Max Khan in October of 2013,
- 24 asking me if I would check a technology start-up company that
- 25 he and some business affiliates were thinking about investing

- 1 in.
- 2 Q And did you do that?
- 3 A Yes, I did.
- 4 Q And how were you involved initially with doing this
- 5 research on Cubed?
- 6 A Initially, I took a look at -- initially, I looked at the
- 7 base product and the presentation to see what they had said
- 8 about the product. And then I looked at the social media
- 9 aspects and did some research on the back-end programming of
- 10 the product, which is a lot of what I'm really familiar with,
- 11 especially at that time. And then I interviewed the -- their
- 12 head of IT or the person that ran their IT team about how they
- 13 were programming the product and how it could expand, how it
- 14 could be handled on the internet, things of that nature.
- 15 Q Did there come a time that you went to Las Vegas?
- 16 A Yes.
- 17 Q And when did you go to Las Vegas?
- 18 A I engaged in a phone conversation with Steve White, who I
- 19 believe at that time was the president of Cubed, and agreed to
- 20 fly to Las Vegas to meet with him and his initial team to
- 21 discuss going onboard with them.
- 22 Q Did you meet Mr. White and his team?
- 23 A Yes, I did.
- 24 Q And at that time, how did you -- did you understand that
- 25 Mr. Discala had a relationship with the company?

- 1 A Yes, I did.
- 2 Q And was that with the group of Mr. White and his team
- 3 | with Mr. Khan on the investment end or something else?
- 4 A No. Mr. Discala -- as I understood, Mr. Discala was with
- 5 the Omni investor group in New York.
- 6 Q So, to your knowledge, at that time, they were not --
- 7 Mr. Discala was not an insider at the company?
- 8 A No, not at all.
- 9 Q And you mentioned that you prepared a report after your
- 10 initial research into the company; is that right?
- 11 A I'm sorry, could you say that again?
- 12 Q Sure. I'll speak in the microphone a little.
- 13 A Thank you.
- 14 Q Sure thing.
- You said you prepared a report after looking into
- 16 the company.
- 17 A Yes.
- MR. SHROYER: If I could show to the witness what's
- 19 been premarked as Defendants' Exhibit 3500-DP-3.
- THE COURT: You may.
- 21 Q And Mr. Parker, if I can have you take a look at the
- screen there, is this the report that you prepared?
- 23 A Yes, it is.
- MR. SHROYER: And it might be easier, your Honor, if
- 25 I approach and hand him a copy.

LAM OCR RPR

If we look at the top here, Mr. Parker, what does that

- 1 say there?
- 2 A Executive summary.
- 3 Q All right. And above that?
- 4 A Crackpot/Cubed Marketing Plan.
- 5 Q Why was it that you came to create a marketing plan for
- 6 Cubed?
- 7 A It was agreed upon in my discussions with Steve White --
- 8 MR. BINI: Objection to discussions with Steve
- 9 White.
- 10 THE COURT: He said that's when it was, it came as a
- 11 result. He didn't tell us what the discussions are.
- 12 This resulted from a discussion with Steve White.
- 13 That question, the objection is overruled.
- 14 Q You can continue, Mr. Parker.
- 15 A As a result of business meetings, it was determined that
- 16 I would engage with Cubed to create a marketing plan and
- 17 marketing documents for them based upon the opinion that I
- 18 submitted to Mr. Khan and then, ultimately, to the rest of the
- 19 investors in New York.
- 20 Q Great. And just briefly, I just want to get a flavor of
- 21 what this document is about. If I could point you to the
- 22 section number two where it says "targeted users;" do you see
- 23 that?
- 24 A Yes, sir.
- 25 Q And under that, you put there "in the USA;" is that

- 1 accurate?
- 2 A Yes.
- 3 Q And, so, this is a portion of the marketing plan about
- 4 how to target individuals in the USA; is that right?
- 5 A At the point this document was used, yes.
- 6 Q Okay. And below that, there's another section for
- 7 | abroad, right?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q And turning to Page 2, there's a specific area about the
- 10 Asia-Pacific region?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q And Mr. Parker, this marketing plan that you devised,
- 13 this was a marketing plan for the actual product; is that
- 14 right?
- 15 A That is correct.
- 16 Q So, this marketing plan had nothing to do with securities
- of the company or shares of stock or anything like that; is
- 18 that correct?
- 19 A That is correct, sir.
- 20 Q Did there come a time that you earned a salary from the
- 21 company known as Cubed?
- 22 A I received a monthly -- I was 1099.
- 23 Q And were you living in Las Vegas at the time?
- 24 A I was traveling back and forth between my original
- 25 hometown Indianapolis and Las Vegas. I was living out of a

- 1 hotel for several weeks at a time.
- 2 Q And who was taking care of your costs and your expenses
- 3 in making that commute?
- 4 A The Crackpot/Cubed company.
- 5 Q And about when was it that you began working on that 1099
- 6 basis for the company as opposed to for Mr. Khan?
- 7 A As I recall, I began actually working for them on the
- 8 first of December, 2013.
- 9 Q And when you started working there, can you tell us
- 10 approximately how many people were working at the Cubed
- 11 office?
- 12 A I believe three to four.
- 2 So, there were approximately three to four people working
- 14 | in the office, but, based on your understanding, were there
- 15 other people based anywhere else that were working for the
- 16 company?
- 17 A Yes, the IT people, the people actually building the
- 18 product.
- 19 Q To your knowledge, approximately how many of those people
- 20 were there?
- 21 A To my recollection, it was about 40 developers in
- 22 Macedonia.
- 23 Q And other than the individuals who are working actually
- 24 in the Cubed office, were you aware of any contract work that
- 25 the company had, any relationships that the company had to

- 1 other individuals who were working for the company on a
- 2 | contract basis?
- 3 A I did not have personal knowledge of that other than
- 4 myself and the -- I actually saw the contract for the IT
- 5 people, their monthly contract.
- 6 Q All right. So, to your knowledge, there was such a
- 7 contract?
- 8 A With the IT people? Yes.
- 9 Q And that was separate from the team of engineers in
- 10 Macedonia?
- 11 A No, that is the Macedonia people.
- 12 Q Understood.
- 13 A Initially, yes.
- MR. SHROYER: And if I could show something just to
- 15 the witness, please.
- 16 THE COURT: You may.
- 17 Q Showing you another document, Mr. Parker, do you
- 18 recognize this document?
- 19 A Yes, I do.
- 20 Q And can you just describe what it is?
- 21 A Yes. Not in much --
- MR. BINI: I'm going to object to the relevance of
- 23 this additional document, which is cumulative of the last one.
- THE COURT: Sustained.
- MR. SHROYER: Your Honor, the timeframe and the

- continuing work that Mr. Parker was doing for the company
 would be the relevance of the document.
- THE COURT: You can ask him if he continued his

 work. The document itself -- frankly, I would have sustained

 the objection to the original one, but go ahead ask him if he

 continued.
- 7 MR. SHROYER: Sure thing. Thank you, your Honor.
- 8 Q Mr. Parker, did you continue to work for Cubed?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q For approximately how long?
- 11 A Officially until February 27.
- 12 Q During that time --
- THE COURT: Of what year, Mr. Parker?
- 14 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, sir. February 27 of 2014.
- 15 Q During that time, did you take part in preparing any
- documents that would be presented to investors?
- 17 A Yes, I did.
- 18 MR. SHROYER: If I could show just to the witness.
- 19 Q Do you recognize this document?
- 20 A Not by the size that's showing up on the screen.
- 21 Q It is zoomed in a bit.
- Does that help you recognize this document?
- 23 A Yes. I believe I played a part in putting that together.
- MR. BINI: Your Honor, I'm going to object to
- relevance now to 3500-DP-8.

Case 1:14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 162 of 243 PageID #: 6000

SIDEBAR 3167 1 (The following occurred at sidebar.) 2 MR. SHROYER: Your Honor, this document --3 THE COURT: Why do you think it's relevant? 4 what? 5 MR. SHROYER: A large portion of the Government's case is based on the proposition that these businesses aren't 6 7 real businesses, that they're empty shells, they never had any 8 value, and, A, this witness is on the stand to show that 9 that's not true, and, B, he can also help to show that even if 10 the Government's proposition is true, that there were steps 11 taken by the company insiders to hide that fact not just from 12 the public but individuals on the outside, such as Mr. Discala. 1.3 THE COURT: The "shell." 14 15 MR. SHROYER: They made the argument -- I shouldn't 16 use the word "shell," that these companies after they went 17 through the reverse merger --18 MR. BINI: This wasn't a reference merger. 19 intellectual property purchase. 20 MR. SHROYER: Semantics. 21 That these companies, after they came out of the 22 transactions that turn them into public entities, that those 23 entities, Cubed, CodeSmart, the Staffing Group, were not real companies. Now, Mr. Parker has already demonstrated to 24

whatever extent that that's not true, that there was a real

SIDEBAR 3168

company with a real product doing a real business.

Now, this next portion of testimony will demonstrate that even if that was true, that there were steps taken by the insiders, the CEO of the company and the people who were based in Las Vegas, to hide the fact that these were empty companies from individuals on the outside, such as Mr. Discala.

MR. BINI: Your Honor, the Government has not argued that Crackpot is not a real company. We've argued that Northwest Resources had fake shareholders that were used and then became Cubed fake shareholders so that the conspirators had complete control of the stock because of this market manipulation. That was the focus of the inquiry and facts.

THE COURT: As I understood the proof, there's never been a question in the Government's case that that application has potential.

MR. SHROYER: There's certainly been argument that the company was overvalued and that the stock price --

THE COURT: We're not getting into value. We're not getting into value. We're not going to have a mini on the value of the Cubed.

MR. SHROYER: Understood.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHROYER: Thank you.

THE COURT: That's why I was surprised that the first document wasn't objected to.

Case 1:	14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 165 of 243 Pag	eID #: 6003
	SIDEBAR	3169
1	MR. BINI: I should have objected to that.	Sorry,
2	your Honor.	
3		
4	(Continued on the next page.)	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 25		
25		

- 1 (Sidebar ends; in open court.)
- 2 BY MR. SHROYER:
- 3 Q Did you play any part in creating revenue projections for
- 4 Cubed?
- 5 A Yes, I did.
- 6 Q And to your knowledge, did Mr. Discala play any part in
- 7 | creating revenue projections for Cubed?
- 8 A Creating revenue projections? No.
- 9 Q Shifting gears just a little bit, when you first started
- 10 at Cubed, to your knowledge, was there anybody at the company
- 11 who was overseeing the financials of the company?
- 12 A To my knowledge, no.
- 13 Q At some point, did that change?
- 14 A Yes.
- 15 Q And who was the individual who was brought in to oversee
- 16 the financials of the company, if you know?
- 17 A Yes, I do. The person -- I'm trying to stick to what
- 18 I -- just what I know.
- The person that was actually selected to come in and
- 20 handle the day-to-day financials, her name was Celeste Jolie
- 21 (phonetic).
- 22 Q And it was -- as you sit here now, sir, do you know the
- 23 impetus for bringing that individual into the company?
- Why was she brought in?
- 25 A She was brought in because she was a friend of Steve

- 1 White.
- 2 Q Now, did there come a time that you left the company?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q And why did you leave the company?
- 5 A I left the company because I felt that -- I felt that
- 6 they -- I felt that they could not --
- 7 Q I don't mean to cut you off.
- 8 Could you just define "they"?
- 9 A Yes. I thought that I could not work with the Whites or
- 10 | their group in Las Vegas.
- 11 Q And why was that?
- 12 A I felt that they were dishonest.
- 13 Q Mr. Parker, when you left the company, did you have any
- 14 | chance or did you tell AJ Discala about your feelings about
- 15 the way the company was being run internally?
- 16 A No.
- 17 Q And, sir, how many times, if at all, have you met
- 18 Mr. Discala?
- 19 A I met Mr. Discala by -- in a phone conference, I believe,
- 20 before I -- when the product was being introduced. He was on
- 21 a phone conference. And I met him I believe one time at the
- 22 Downtown Grand when everybody was coming in for, like, a
- 23 product launch meeting.
- 24 Q Is it fair to say you don't have a personal relationship
- 25 | with Mr. Discala?

- 21 period?
- 22 A I was paid by the Cube. I was paid \$6,000 a month.
- 23 Q And you testified earlier you had a background in law
- 24 enforcement, right?
- 25 A Yes.

PARKER - CROSS - BINI

- 1 Q In fact, you had some background in white collar crime,
- 2 right?
- 3 A Yes, sir.
- 4 Q And did you come across pump and dumps in your training
- 5 as a police officer in white collar crime?
- 6 A You know, no. Most of the white collar crime training,
- 7 | it was kind of before that time period.
- 8 Q Okay. But fair to say, sir, you really know nothing
- 9 about the trading of Cubed, right?
- 10 A That is correct. Nothing at all.
- 11 Q In fact, when the defense first contacted you, that's why
- 12 you told them you're not sure you'd be a good witness in this
- 13 case, right?
- 14 A That is correct.
- 15 Q And, sir, you don't know anything about Northwest
- 16 Resources, right?
- 17 A The original Cubed company? No.
- 18 Q And you don't know about the 30 shareholders that
- 19 controlled all the free-trading shares of that company, right?
- 20 A No, I do not.
- 21 Q And you don't know about the 30 or so shareholders who
- 22 control all the free-trading shares of Cubed, correct?
- 23 A True.
- 24 Q Fair to say you really know nothing about the facts in
- 25 this case?

Case 1:14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 171 of 243 PageID #: 6009				
	PARKER - CROSS - BINI 3175			
1	THE WITNESS: George Eric Engstrom, G-E-O-R-G-E			
2	E-R-I-C E-N-G-S-T-R-O-M.			
3	THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Thank you. Have a seat,			
4	please.			
5	THE COURT: Mr. Shroyer.			
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

Honor.

23

24

Q Mr. Engstrom, can you describe for us your professional

25 background?

ENGSTROM - DIRECT - SHROYER

A Yes. After leaving college I worked in Eastern
Washington mostly as a software contractor, and then I was
recruited to Western Washington, which would be the Seattle
area; actually Redmond, but you might as well think of it as
Seattle. I turned down a job from Microsoft, who had
recruited me to come there because they offered me stock
options in lieu of \$3,000 of extra salary. That was the first
time I lost lots of money by not taking stock options.

Two and a half years later, they offered me a job again and I took it, as an evangelist, because they wanted somebody who could write code and, in their words, had a personality. I'm not sure how to take that either. But one thing led to another, and I ended up co-inventing a thing called Direct X, which turned into the Xbox and now is the technology behind HoloLens. So, myself and two other individuals made that from the beginning.

As a result of that success, I was put in charge of what was called at the time multimedia at Microsoft. You would probably think of that mostly as DVD playback on Windows. I was the person that thought that people would want to watch movies on planes. I know that sounds kind of amazing today that anyone thought that was heretical. I made a browser from there that would allow you to do NFL-style visual effects on the web in 1998.

That led me to -- well, it was called Netscape

ENGSTROM - DIRECT - SHROYER

Killer, and that was the anti-trust trial time. So, between that and wanting to make sure that any movie you had could play on your PC, I wasn't -- "invited" would be the word I would use, to become a witness for Microsoft in the anti-trust trial.

MS. JONES: Objection, relevance.

THE COURT: Just giving his background.

A So, I quit Microsoft largely after that. I did some due diligence for Microsoft. Probably the one you'd know the most is Hotmail, and I was responsible for stopping a \$3 billion acquisition that Mr. Steve Ballmer, the CEO, still thanks me for today.

I then started several companies, but the one that I think is most interesting is the Wildseed company, which was the first consumer-based smartphone. It was designed to be entertaining more than just a phone that got your e-mail. That was in 2000.

We sold the company to AOL in 2005 for about \$280 million.

I then went back into the -- I was SVP at AOL for a couple of years and then rejoined Microsoft in 2009, after the 2008 conditions in the market left there no -- there was no venture capital to fund start-up companies.

And since leaving Microsoft in 2014, I have been building internet of things, technologies, for my various

Case 1:	4-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 175 of 243 PageID #: 6013
	ENGSTROM - DIRECT - SHROYER 3179
1	companies.
2	
3	(Continued on next page.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

ENGSTROM - DIRECT - SHROYER

3180

1 CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHROYER:

2.

3

4

6

9

10

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q Okay. And at some point around that time that you mentioned you stopped working for Microsoft, maybe a bit

5 earlier, did you become aware of a company known as Scanbuy?

A Yes. I need to pop back a little back. The CEO was Mike

7 Wehrs at the time. Mike Wehrs I knew from Microsoft. He was

8 also an associate partner of the company that invested

Wildseed. And I had subsequently hired him when I was at AOL

to help me with mobile marketing, that was his expertise. He

11 eventually became the president, I think, of the mobile

12 marketing association.

I needed some technology that Scanbuy had, mostly for my wife's company, so I called Mr. Wehrs and asked him if he would help me. He said yes. So we started talking about that.

And I subsequently changed groups at Microsoft, this was while I was at Microsoft, and ended up with a technology called Microsoft hag (ph), which was a scanning technology different from bar codes and QR codes. Microsoft research had invented it and no longer wanted it, but we had critical corporate customers who relied on it. Mike Wehrs and I worked out a deal where Microsoft would have transfer it to him if he would agree to take care of those customers. And in exchange for that, I became an adviser on — not an adviser, I need to

ENGSTROM - DIRECT - SHROYER

- 1 be very accurate -- I was a board observer in my capacity as a
- 2 Microsoft general manager.
- 3 Q Approximately when was that that you took on that role
- 4 with Scanbuy?
- 5 A 2013, it might have been as early as the fall of 2012.
- 6 It didn't seem very significant at the time, I'm sorry.
- 7 Q Did there come a time through your involvement with
- 8 | Scanbuy that you met an individual named AJ Discala?
- 9 A Yes. Mr. Wehrs said I should meet AJ who was helping him
- 10 put together a funding rep. I was invited by Mr. Wehrs to
- 11 dinner with Mr. Discala. And there were three or four other
- 12 | gentlemen, I'm terrible with names and I'm face-blank, please
- 13 forgive me. One of them was a Ford trustee, that's the only
- 14 thing I remember about the other four.
- 15 Q Did you learn of a company called Cubed?
- 16 A I did. Mr. Wehrs knew about Cubed. And perhaps that was
- 17 the reason he brought me to dinner, as much as anything. The
- 18 browser I spoke of in 1998 was a 3D powered browser that did
- 19 things very much like the Cube did. We have a much larger
- development team, so it did more things than that, but it had
- 21 a lot of web-based 3D graphical user interfaces. AJ said,
- 22 Wow, you know something about that. And I said, I know a lot
- about 3D.
- MS. JONES: Objection.
- THE COURT: Sustained.

ENGSTROM - DIRECT - SHROYER

- 1 Q Leave out things that other people said.
- 2 A I'm sorry.
- 3 Q Did there come a time that you became involved with the
- 4 company known as Cubed?
- 5 A Yes. As a result of that dinner, I was asked to do some
- 6 due diligence.
- 7 Q And did you do that due diligence?
- 8 A I flew to Las Vegas and met with the team. And let's
- 9 | see, in that process I met Steve White, his son, a man named
- 10 JT, and his brother, and an attorney named Kyleen Cane helped
- me with all the MBAs and et cetera, stuff I'm supposed to sign
- 12 before I look at a company.
- 13 Q Did you have a chance to review the product?
- 14 A I did, and the team.
- 15 Q And what was your feeling about the company after those
- 16 meetings?
- 17 A My feeling was that the team was green, but that was an
- 18 easy problem to solve. That's something I do all the time.
- 19 Their passion for their product and the user interface inside
- 20 was quite exciting, especially from my experience in mobile.
- 21 One of the most interesting things is phone numbers are unlike
- 22 static, unlike URLs, everyone can say whatever they want about
- 23 you on your phone number --
- MS. JONES: Objection. Relevance.
- THE COURT: I'm going to allow that answer. Move

E. ENGSTROM - CROSS - MS. JONES

- 1 you met Mr. Discala for the first time in or about May 2014?
- 2 A I met him at the dinner, that may have been May or June,
- 3 sorry, but yes.
- 4 \mathbb{Q} At that time what were you doing for a job?
- 5 A I was interviewing. I was trying to decide at the moment
- 6 whether I should go back into start ups, I was actually
- 7 | interviewing Bloomberg at the time.
- 8 Q So you may have met Mr. Discala you said in May or June
- 9 of 2014?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q And isn't it correct that by June of 2014 you were
- 12 referring to Mr. Discala as your new partner in an e-mail to
- 13 Ted Stockwell?
- 14 A Probably.
- 15 Q And isn't it true that you indicated to Mr. Stockwell
- 16 that Mr. Discala was going to help you with your Microsoft
- 17 | situation, correct?
- 18 A He did say that, yes.
- 19 Q And that situation was that Microsoft had fired both you
- 20 and Mr. Stockwell at the end of 2013, correct?
- 21 A Actually they fired me on January 15, 2014; but no reason
- 22 to quibble.
- 23 Q And by early July 2014, your opinion expressed in an
- 24 e-mail was that Mr. Discala and Mr. Wexler were great men and
- 25 you were pleased to be dealing with them?

E. ENGSTROM - CROSS - MS. JONES

- 1 A That was absolutely my impression at the time, yes.
- 2 Q By July of 2014 Mr. Discala is trying to get you on the
- 3 Board of Cubed, correct?
- 4 A Yes, and Scanbuy.
- 5 Q Mr. Discala offered you stock options to be on the board
- 6 of Cubed?
- 7 A Yes, that is normal for me.
- 8 Q Do you know if these were stock options for free-trading
- 9 stock or restricted stock?
- 10 A So to be pedantic, in my world restricted stock would
- 11 mean that I actually got the shares. And when I heard stock
- 12 options, that would be like what I got at Microsoft, which was
- an option to buy in the future at the strike price that they
- 14 were branded at. The difference being restricted stock is
- 15 | granted at a price of zero.
- 16 O So what was your understanding as to what you would get
- 17 | if you went on the board of Cubed?
- 18 A He used the word options, so I took it as my strike price
- 19 at the time.
- 20 Q That you would be able to buy unrestricted stock at a
- 21 strike price?
- 22 A Over a vesting schedule in the future.
- 23 Q Had you negotiated the amount of stock options you were
- 24 | going to get?
- 25 A No.

E. ENGSTROM - CROSS - MS. JONES 3186

- 1 Q Had you negotiated the strike price?
- 2 A The strike price is never negotiated. In my -- I don't
- 3 know, I can't say never. Strike prices for options are
- 4 generally some day in the future the market is at. In my
- 5 case, it was October 1st, 1991, for Microsoft.
- 6 Q Isn't it correct that in the middle of approximately
- 7 | middle July 2014 you traveled to Connecticut and spent the
- 8 | night at Mr. Discala's house?
- 9 A Yes, because the hotel situation in the town he lives in
- 10 is terrible. I arrived at midnight.
- 11 Q Because you had a meeting planned with Mr. Discala,
- 12 correct?
- 13 A Yes.
- 14 Q This was within days of Mr. Discala being arrested,
- 15 correct?
- 16 A I'm not sure which side of the days it was. But I'm not
- disputing that I saw him very soon before and after he was
- 18 arrested.
- 19 Q When Mr. Discala was arrested, you had known him for
- 20 maybe six weeks?
- 21 A Yes.
- 22 Q And after Mr. Discala was arrested, you served as the
- 23 interim CEO of Omni View?
- 24 A Yes. In an attempt to -- everyone was afraid --
- 25 Q Mr. Engstrom, it's a yes or no question.

E. ENGSTROM - CROSS - MS. JONES 3187

- 1 A Well, I feel like it requires some explanation. Because
- 2 I wasn't just the interim CEO, it was limited specifically to
- 3 doing things necessary to get the investors' cash back. I
- 4 | couldn't do anything else for Omni View, only work to get
- 5 their cash back. Because no one would touch the cash. And
- 6 those investors should have gotten the money back, and they
- 7 got their money back.
- 8 Q You're talking about Scanbuy investors?
- 9 A Yes.
- 10 Q Not Cubed?
- 11 A I had nothing to do with Cubed investors.
- 12 Q And not all Scanbuy investors got their money, correct?
- 13 A That is correct. Some of them refused take their money
- 14 back. And others I couldn't get it back because the
- 15 Government took it back in a civil forfeiture.
- 16 Q There wasn't money to pay the investors back, is that
- 17 | what you're saying?
- 18 A One set of investors -- there are three sets. One set of
- 19 investors got three-and-a-half million dollar for them to take
- 20 back. Another set chose to leave their money in Scanbuy
- 21 because they were already invested in Scanbuy. The third set
- 22 didn't get the money back because the Government took it in a
- 23 civil forfeiture.
- 24 O From Omni View.
- 25 A Yes, that's where the money was sent to, to go to

MS. JONES: No further questions.

THE COURT: Any cross by Mr. Riopelle?

MR. RIOPELLE: No questions for Ms. Cane.

Official Court Reporter

23

24

Case 1:	14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 185 of 243 PageID #: 6023
	E. ENGSTROM - CROSS - MS. JONES 3189
1	THE COURT: Mr. Shroyer, any redirect?
2	MR. SHROYER: No, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: You're excused. Let's see counsel at
4	sidebar.
5	(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
6	(Continued on the next page.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SIDEBAR CONFERENCE 3190 MR. CHENG: Ms. Eckhart is available, but we have revised the schedules and we just don't have the ability to the print them. I was going to suggest we start with her first thing in the morning. I could provide within the next -- the electronic, provide what we're going to use that's been revised. We can just move to the jury charge conference. MS. JONES: Why don't we get started, if we can. THE COURT: Why don't you figure on to about 20 minutes to 30 minutes? MR. CHENG: We can go through her background. MR. HEIN: How long do you anticipate the witness? Taking out the schedules, say an hour MR. CHENG: maybe a little less. MS. JONES: How many exhibits are you planning on introducing through her? MR. CHENG: I reduced it down to, I don't recall the number, 12 to 15. MS. JONES: Do you have print outs? MR. CHENG: I revised them so I have don't have the ability to print, which is why I'm asking to move to tomorrow. MS. JONES: We can start and I guess we'll do the

rest tomorrow morning. THE COURT: Why don't we do this. Why don't you

start and then when you get to the point where you you're

going want to use the substantive exhibit down the road you'll

Case 1:14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 187 of 243 PageID #: 6025 SIDEBAR CONFERENCE say, we reached a break point. (End of sidebar conference.) (Continued on the next page.)

Case 1:14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 188 of 243 PageID #: 6026 H. ECKHART - DIRECT - MR. CHENG 3192 1 (In open court.) 2 THE COURT: Is there another witness? 3 MR. ROSS: Mr. Discala is going to call Haley 4 Eckhart. 5 (Witness takes the witness stand.) 6 HALEY ECKHART, called as a witness, having been first duly 7 sworn/affirmed, was examined and testified as follows: 8 THE WITNESS: I do. 9 COURTROOM DEPUTY: State your first and last name. 10 THE WITNESS: Haley Eckhart, H-A-L-E-Y, 11 E-C-K-H-A-R-T. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Cheng, you may inquire. 1.3 MR. CHENG: Thank you, your Honor. 14 DIRECT EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. CHENG: 16 Good morning. 17 Good morning -- good afternoon. 18 Good afternoon. Can you tell us what your occupation is? 19 I'm a CPA and I do forensic accounting and economic 20 damages calculations. 2.1 With where is your place of employment? 22 I'm work at Freeman and Mills, Incorporated. I am Vice 23 President and a shareholder of the firm. 2.4 How long have you held that position? 25 I've had that position since 2005, but I've been with the

- H. ECKHART DIRECT MR. CHENG 3193
- 1 firm mostly since 1996, so it's going on 22 years.
- THE COURT: Where what is the firm located?
- 3 THE WITNESS: In Los Angeles California.
- 4 Q Where did you work prior to that?
- 5 A I worked at Ernst & Young, also in Los Angeles,
- 6 California.
- 7 Q Can you briefly describe the subject matter of your
- 8 specialty?
- 9 A As I mentioned, I do forensic accounting and expert
- 10 witness work. And I work on litigation matters, both civil
- 11 and criminal, for companies and individuals. Companies as
- 12 small as a sole proprietor mom-and-pop company, to Fortune 500
- 13 companies, doing consulting and expert witness work.
- 14 Q What academic degrees do you hold and where and when were
- 15 they obtained?
- 16 A I graduated in 1992 from the University of California at
- 17 Santa Barbara. And my degree was a Bachelor's of Arts in
- 18 business economics with an emphasis in accounting.
- 19 Q Are you licensed in any fields?
- 20 A As a CPA licensed by the State of California to practice
- 21 as a CPA, or Certified Public Accountant. I'm also licensed
- 22 in the state of Arizona, I had lived there for a few years.
- 23 Q How long have you held those licenses?
- 24 A My California my licensed I got that in 1997, I believe.
- 25 In Arizona it's sometime in the early 2000s.

H. ECKHART - DIRECT - MR. CHENG 3194

- Q Do you have any other credentials?
- 2 A I'm also a Certified Fraud Examiner or CFO. That's a
- 3 | credential I obtained through the Certified Fraud Examiners, a
- 4 world-wide organization.
- 5 Q What are the duties and functions of your current
- 6 position?

- 7 A As I mentioned, I do litigation consulting and expert
- 8 | witness work doing forensic accounting and damage
- 9 calculations.
- 10 Q Are you a member in any professional associations or
- 11 organizations?
- 12 A I'm a member in the American Institute of Certified
- 13 Public Accountants, AICPA. As well as the California Society
- 14 of CPAs, and the Arizona Society of CPAs. I'm also a member
- of the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. And with the
- 16 California Society of CPAs, I'm the recent past Chair of its
- 17 economic damages section.
- 18 Q What type of matters do you consult on or have you
- 19 consulted on?
- 20 A I've worked on matters, as I mentioned, in both civil and
- 21 criminal cases. In civil cases it could be anything from a
- 22 personal injury, to a huge business interruption case for a
- 23 Fortune 500 company that sustained huge losses after hurricane
- 24 Katrina. I've also done consulting work both for and working
- 25 for the Government, the SEC, and the DOJ in certain criminal

H. ECKHART - DIRECT - MR. CHENG 3195 1 matters back in the early 2000s and/or middle 2000s. And also 2 criminal cases defending the individuals in those, I guess, 3 stock option, back dating cases, and revenue recognition cases. 5 Have you ever testified as an expert in forensic 6 accounting before? 7 Yes, I have. 8 How many times? I've testified 34 times, 11 of those have been at trial. 9 10 MR. CHENG: Do you think this would be a nice time 11 to take a brake? 12 THE COURT: Yes. We've reached a break point in 1.3 this examination, ladies and gentlemen. I had ask Mr. Cheng 14 to alert me to when we would get to that break point and he 15 has, and I'm grateful for that. 16 We are going to recess for the evening. The usual 17 recess rules apply. And I will review them again for you. 18 Continue to keep an open mind. Don't discuss the case amongst 19 yourselves or with anyone else. Do not do over the recess 20 period any research, electronic or otherwise, touching on 21 anything related to the case, penalties, the issues, the 22 names. Do not, if you're on a social media platform, do not, 23 you're on radio silence. You're not to mention anything about 24 the case, your service as a juror, that you come to the 25 courthouse in Brooklyn, or anything that relates to directly

H. ECKHART - DIRECT - MR. CHENG 3196 1 or obliquely to the case. And lastly, to the extent there is 2 any media coverage, using that broad definition of media, 3 you're to shut it out. If it relates to this case, keep your 4 eyes, mind, ears closed to. I also urge you, as I do every 5 end of day, urge you to tune out any media accounts of other 6 proceedings for fear that you may hear something there that might confuse you as to what your responsibilities are here. 7 8 All of those continued admonitions and with our 9 continued appreciation for your sacrifice and your patience, 10 we will bid you a pleasant evening. We'll see you tomorrow. 11 Return to the central jury room around 9:45 a.m. and we'll get 12 started as close as we can. 1.3 (Jury exits the courtroom.) 14 THE COURT: Ms. Eckhart, you may stand down. 15 Take a ten-minute break. Then we'll return and vou tomorrow. 16 distribute the hard copies of the charge as proposed, which 17 the clerk will mark as Court Exhibit 1. And the proposed 18 verdict sheet which the clerk will mark as Court Exhibit 1A. 19 (Whereupon, the witness steps down.) 20 (Continued next page.) 21 22 23 24 25

side of the courthouse, whatever, whoever's got the first

objection on the lowest page, that's where we go, and then

we'll go to the next lowest page objection and we'll go from

23

24

3198

1 there.

2.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Just sing out if you an objection.

3 MR. RIOPELLE: Yes.

And, Your Honor, I will note that I had submitted written proposals to the Court, which I see some of which are incorporated, some of which are not. I have gone back to those proposals, compared them to what we have here. And so I'm ready to yodel about those.

THE COURT: Yes. So there was some minor modifications from the exposure draft, so it's not like some of your suggestions were incorporated into this draft that we actually are holding the charge conference on.

MR. RIOPELLE: Right.

MR. BINI: Your Honor, Mark Bini for the government.

One note that I did not submit and I should have submitted, but in reviewing ECF 601, I notice that there is no aiding and abetting charge.

We had requested that because our substantive counts, counts now Three through Ten, all charge 18 U.S.C. 2, the aiding and abetting statute. So that's government's request number seven in ECF 541 where we ask for the standard aiding and abetting charges.

So I'll just -- I guess when we get to after Count Three, the first substantive count, I'll just note it at that point.

3200

1 "In addition, I remind you that the government did 2 not play all of the wiretaps that were intercepted in the 3 case, and they played only excerpts from some of the wiretaps 4 that it did play. The law does not allow the defendants to 5 play wiretaps or excerpts from wiretaps, however, the law does 6 permit the defendants to argue that the wiretaps were played 7 by the government are insufficient to establish their guilt 8 beyond a reasonable doubt, and you may consider whether the 9 government has played all of the wiretaps, or produced all of 10 the text messages on a particular subject when deciding 11 whether the government has proven a particular defendant's 12 quilt beyond a reasonable doubt." 1.3 I think, Your Honor, in fairness that language I note that you did not include it. 14 should be included. 15 will expect that you will adhere to that ruling. 16 THE COURT: Well, let me hear from the government. 17 MR. RIOPELLE: But I've made my objection. 18 MR. BINI: Your Honor, the government does object to 19 that additional language because it's in direct conflict with 20 no specific investigative techniques are required and that not 21 all evidence need be produced. And so the government would 22 request the instruction that Your Honor has proposed. 23 THE COURT: And, Mr. Riopelle, you didn't, I don't recall and refresh me, you didn't have a Sands site for the 24 25 language, correct?

3201 1 MR. RIOPELLE: That is correct. 2 Your Honor, the reason I think it is fair to include 3 some kind of language like this, is that, as the Court knows 4 from our first in limine motion, we were desperate to play 5 some of the wiretaps that the government did not want played. 6 You know, I recognize that as a general matter the 7 hearsay rule does not allow the defendants to offer this 8 evidence, and it does seem unfair to me to keep the fact that 9 the defense cannot offer this evidence from the jury. 10 The jury knows because they've heard it testified to 11 that there were thousands of calls intercepted and yet they've 12 heard only a couple of dozen here and they've heard only 1.3 excerpts from the calls. I do not -- you know, I'm afraid that if the 14 15 government -- if the jury is not told that the defendants 16 cannot offer this evidence, that they will shift the burden to 17 us and hold us responsible for not offering that evidence. 18 And so for that reason, I think it's only fair to 19 instruct them that you can't do it. 20 THE COURT: You have your exception, of course, 21 Mr. Riopelle, but my charges, if anything, I know that the

government mudders I'm sure across the street of the number of times I tell the jury that the defendant has absolutely no burden.

22

23

24

25

And I thank you for that, MR. RIOPELLE: Yes.

THE COURT: That was my recollection as well. If it's easier to take it out than to try to put it in, I guess we're going to find out in spades here, when we have to inject the aiding and abetting one. Much easier to be over inclusive in the first round.

MR. RIOPELLE: Agreed, Your Honor.

21

22

23

2.4

piece of information," I would add a comma and then insert the

3205

1 language "or call every witness that was interviewed, or play 2 every call that was recorded, or admit every text message 3 seized, period." 4 That sort of draws the jury's attention to specific 5 evidence in this case, and that was why I thought it would be 6 useful. 7 THE COURT: The government? 8 MR. BINI: We prefer it as proposed. I think this 9 is the Sands, and I'm just looking to see. THE COURT: I usually adhere very closely to Sands. 10 11 Very, very rarely do I deviate, but sometimes when all counsel 12 in a particular case think a slight modification is 1.3 appropriate, I yield to that. 14 MR. RIOPELLE: The modification here was simply 15 meant to draw the jury's attention to some of the facts that 16 they have heard in the case, and what some of the evidence 17 that is really key to the case. 18 THE COURT: The government? 19 MR. BINI: Your Honor, the government believes this excess verbiage in what I know is going to be a long reading 20 21 for your clerk, and I think it's captured in the Sands 22 instruction, so we would ask for a Sands instruction. 23 MR. RIOPELLE: I'm being accused of excess verbiage. 24 THE COURT: Shocked. By the inspector of the ever

25

like.

3206

1 Well, as I say I usually adhere to Sands, and once I 2 get some yield... It covers what you're concerned about, and 3 that's why I'm going to yield. 4 MR. RIOPELLE: I think you have the general in the 5 charge as drafted, and I want to be a little more specific. 6 THE COURT: Yes, I hear you. 7 MR. RIOPELLE: Okay. My next one is on 52 of the 8 Court as proposed charge. 9 The Court had listed seven items that the jury might 10 wish to consider in determining the credibility of the 11 witnesses that it saw. 12 I had proposed the addition of a eighth paragraph, 1.3 which reads as follows, paragraph 8: "Did the witness tell a falsehood to a law 14 15 enforcement agent about matters relevant to this case when the 16 witness was interviewed?" 17 We had a lot of testimony from witnesses in this 18 case, Your Honor, who admitted or testified that they told a 19 lot of lies to law enforcement agents when they were first 20 interviewed. 21 Obviously, that is something that I will argue at 22 some length to the jury. It goes to the credibility of the 23 witness. Given the fact that so many of the witnesses in this 24 case are in that position, it seems to me only correct to 25 highlight that as something that the jury may wish to

1 consider.

1.3

MR. BINI: Your Honor, the government prefers the same instruction as you had proposed it.

There is, in fact, an instruction regarding prior inconsistent statements.

THE COURT: That is correct.

MR. BINI: And there's also an instruction regarding cooperating accomplice testimony and immunized witnesses.

THE COURT: Yes, I'm going not going to accept your invitation, Mr. Riopelle.

MR. RIOPELLE: Fair enough.

THE COURT: It's in the nature of another thing you will note is that I try to steer away as studiously as I can from marshaling evidence in any case, whether a civil case or a criminal case. That is in the nature of marshaling the evidence.

I think that these non sort of case-related tests of credibility of generic tests are what this charge was supposed to capture, and I think the government is correct, unless you have any other charges that will yield quite expressly with the credibility of people who come here either immunized or a cooperation agreement having lied to the government at some point prior to obtaining that protection.

MR. RIOPELLE: Okay, I will take care of it in the defense argument.

3208

1 THE COURT: Yes, I'm sure you will, as is 2 appropriate. 3 MR. RIOPELLE: Okay, that takes me to 59. 4 Mr. Bini, am I you still ahead of you? 5 MR. BINI: Yes, you are. 6 MR. RIOPELLE: On page 59, Your Honor, we reach what 7 I think is a interesting issue about the Court's charge for 8 the testimony of immunized witnesses. There are a number of immunized witnesses in this 9 10 case, but interestingly enough, these witnesses are merely 11 all, with the exception of David Ben-Bassat, testifying about 12 other acts, similar acts, predecessor acts to the acts charged 1.3 in the indictment. 14 So the Court's charge, which is the standard charge 15 reads that you can convict these defendants on that testimony 16 alone, but that testimony does not go to the charges in the 17 indictment. 18 And even Mr. Ben-Bassat's testimony does not 19 directly go to the charge -- you know, he doesn't say, I know 20 the market was manipulated. I did wrong and I did it with 21 others. His testimony was different. In fact, I believe his 22 testimony was that he didn't think he had done anything wrong. 23 So it would be my position that in this unique 24 circumstance of this case, the testimony of the immunized 25 witnesses is not alone enough to convict the defendants of

guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, because these witnesses are not testifying directly about the issues charged as per the events, charged as the crimes.

Most of the immunized witnesses are testifying about the creation of Northwest Resources some years before the conspiracy in the indictment is charged, and so I think this language needs to be adjusted. I have my proposal here, and that is the nature of my objection. It's kind of an interesting one.

So I don't know what the Court makes of that.

THE COURT: Yes, I think -- I agree. I think it's a very interesting one.

MR. RIOPELLE: Yes.

1.3

THE COURT: Does anyone on the government's side disagree with Mr. Riopelle's analysis that the subject matter of testimony of the immunized witnesses do not relate directly to the charged conduct, and that testimony alone indeed would not be enough to convict?

MR. BINI: I think the testimony of David Ben-Bassat would be enough.

But in any event, Judge Sand and the imponent wisdom of the Sand instruction has realized this in the instruction where they say: "Like the testimony of cooperating witnesses, you may convict the defendant on the basis of such witness' testimony alone, if you find that the testimony proves that a

PROCEEDINGS 3210 1 defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt." 2 So I think that goes to that. If the testimony 3 proves them quilty beyond a reasonable doubt, I think that 4 with respect to Wesley Smith, Taylor Edgerton, while we think 5 that the testimony was very important, and if you believe 6 them, I would concede that that does not establish quilt 7 beyond a reasonable doubt. THE COURT: What would you change, Mr. Riopelle? 8 9 MR. RIOPELLE: My change was -- in the first 10 paragraph, I would change that first sentence to read -- it's 11 the first sentence really of the instruction: 12 "As you were informed during the trial, comma, some 1.3 of the testimony before you came from witnesses who were 14 assured by the government that in exchange for testifying 15 truthfully, completely and fully, they would not be 16 prosecuted," and then I've stricken the phrase "based on their 17 testimony for any crimes that they may have admitted to the 18 government, comma, or here in the court." 19 Then the next paragraph I would have it read as 20 follows: 21 Like the testimony of cooperating witnesses, the 22

Like the testimony of cooperating witnesses, the testimony of a witness who has been -- "Like the testimony of cooperating witnesses, comma, the testimony of a witness who has been promised that he will not be prosecuted, should be examined by you with greater care than the testimony of an

23

24

1	ordinary witness. You should scrutinize it closely to
2	determine whether or not it is colored in such a way as to
3	place guilt upon the defendant in order to further the
4	witness' own interest. You must consider whether such a
5	witness was motivated to make up testimony in the hope or
6	belief that such was more likely to ensure the witness' own
7	freedom from prosecution, or ask yourselves did the witness
8	believe his interests would be best served by testifying
9	truthfully, it is for you to decide based on your own
10	perceptions and common sense to what extent, if at all, the
11	witness' interest has been affected or colored or has
12	affected or colored his testimony, you should carefully
13	scrutinize all the evidence." And then I've got "in
14	connection with the witness' testimony." And what is what I
15	propose, Judge.
16	MR. BINI: Your Honor, the government does not
17	oppose the changes to the first paragraph that are proposed by
18	defense counsel, however, after that the government would
19	prefers the Sands instruction.
20	THE COURT: How much of that second paragraph did
21	you change? What words did you take out and what words
22	MR. RIOPELLE: I took out the words as follows. The
23	paragraph in Sands I believe reads:
24	"Like the testimony of cooperating witnesses, comma,
25	you may convict the defendant on the basis of such witness'

	FROCEEDINGS 3212
1	testimony alone if you find that the testimony proves the
2	defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt," period.
3	THE COURT: And that's the
4	MR. RIOPELLE: That's the piece I took out.
5	THE COURT: And you added to replace that in that
6	sentence with what?
7	MR. RIOPELLE: I then just continued on with the
8	next sentence in Sands which is:
9	"The testimony of a witness who has been promised
10	that he will not"
11	THE COURT: In other words, you added nothing new?
12	MR. RIOPELLE: I added nothing new. I just took out
13	the bit about "you can convict him on that testimony alone."
14	THE COURT: Yes, I will accept the change.
15	MR. RIOPELLE: Thank you, Your Honor.
16	My next objection is on 62, so I think Mr. Bini
17	MR. BINI: No.
18	MR. RIOPELLE: Okay. This is the Court's similar
19	act charge. It is the standard charge from Sands. But we
20	have a case in which the similar acts are really prior acts,
21	background-type proof rather than modus-operandi-similar act
22	type proof. So I have proposed a change to this charge as
23	well just to make it more, tighten the applicable to the
24	circumstances of this case, Your Honor.
25	What I have done is proposed an amended charge which

3213

would read as follows:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"During this trial, you have heard evidence that on other occasions a defendant engaged in conduct that was similar in nature to the conduct charged in the indictment, or was background to the conduct charged in the indictment. Evidence of prior or similar acts was admitted as background evidence to show the development of the relationships of trust between the defendant Discala and the government's witnesses, and to provide background evidence of the charged crimes and how they developed. However, I caution you that a defendant is on trial only for committing the acts alleged in the You may not consider evidence of any previous or indictment. similar acts as a substitute for proof that any defendant committed the crimes charged in this case, nor may you consider this evidence as " -- evidence as -- I'm having difficulty reading my draft. "You may consider it only for the limited purpose of providing you with the background of the offense charged in the indictment."

So what I'm really trying to get at, Judge, is I think that, for example, the Northwest Resources proof, which is a very big part of the case here, is, you know, Ms. Cane is really not a direct actor in that proof, she's not somebody who is dealing with the witnesses at all. And I think it's important that the jury understand that this is admitted as sort of background to the proof in the case. It is not

1.3

PROCEEDINGS

admitted as a prior similar act to what happened in the case, and I think by amending the charge in this way, it emphasizes that it's admitted as background makes the purpose of the Court's admission of the evidence clearer to the jury.

MR. BINI: Your Honor, the government believes that we should have the standard *Sands* instruction here, because, among other things, there was admission during the testimony of Matt Bell of manipulation of other stocks, precisely for 404(b) purposes — manipulation with Discala with other stocks precisely for 404(b) purposes to show the absence of mistake. So that we believe that's classic 404(b) evidence, so we would ask for the standard same instruction.

MR. RIOPELLE: Yes, the strange case where the evidence as it relates to Ms. Cane is really background, and there may be some other 404(b) evidence as to Mr. Discala, you know, some of those other transactions that are not charged.

MR. BINI: And the government doesn't believe that the evidence regarding Northwest Resources is not at all just background evidence. The government believes it goes to the heart of control of the 8 million shares of Cubed as we just showed with our the witnesses where we put on basically recruiter, the fake CEO, and then Marche Godffrey one of the fake shareholders.

THE COURT: I'm going to adhere to the Sands charge. We tried to de-pluralize this as best we could.

3215

1 MR. RIOPELLE: Thank you, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Try to get the jury to focus separately 3 with respect to each defendant. 4 MR. RIOPELLE: Okay. That takes me to 66, it looks 5 like. Yes, I have sort of a small quibble with what's on 6 page 66. 7 THE COURT: Okay. 8 MR. RIOPELLE: It's a quibble with the Sands charge, 9 I'll note. 10 The charge there talks about: "If you find a 11 reasonable doubt has been created, you must acquit him or her 12 of all charges." 1.3 The reason I worry about that languages is it sounds almost like burden shifting to the defendant requiring the 14 defendant to create a reasonable doubt. 15 16 I would proposes that if you -- and this is in 17 connection with the character evidence, which, of course, my client has offered, I would proposes that the Court amend the 18 19 charge to read that: 20 "If you find you have a reasonable doubt as to the 21 defendant's quilt, you must acquit him or her of all the 22 charges, " rather than saying: 23 "If you find that a reasonable doubt has been 24 created by the character evidence, " because that sounds like 25 the burden shifting to me. But that may be a quibble that is,

	PROCEEDINGS 3216
1	you know, academic.
2	THE COURT: Does the government have any position?
3	MR. BINI: The government thinks the Sands
4	instruction is appropriate, and it does not shift the burden.
5	THE COURT: Yes, I will adhere to Sands, given the
6	number of times I make it clear that you have no burden.
7	MR. RIOPELLE: Thank you, Your Honor. That takes me
8	to page 67.
9	MR. BINI: And the government agrees with Ms. Cane
10	that this particular charge was envisioned I think we had
11	proposed it because Mr. Morris was in the case, and there was
12	no SEC testimony that remains in this case.
13	THE COURT: All right.
14	MR. RIOPELLE: Very good. So that's out.
15	THE COURT: So that's out.
16	Okay. Next lowest number?
17	MR. RIOPELLE: Oh, on the defendant's right not to
18	testify I'm up to page 68 or 69 of the Court's charge.
19	I had proposed to insert into the standard Sands
20	charge a little bit of language that appears at the end of the
21	chapter in Sands about the defendant's right not to testify;
22	that, you know, there may be any number of reasons why a
23	defendant chooses not to testify, and you should not and
24	that language is important I think given my client's gender
25	status to include.

3217

1 And then at the end I had inserted some additional 2 language from that blurb in Sands, which reads as follows: 3 "In other words, you should simply put the whole matter of the defendant not testifying out of your mind, "and 4 5 period there. And I think there is a list and a little blurb in 6 Sands which somehow didn't come through on my notes here of 7 8 the reasons why -- the any number of reasons why the defendant 9 might not testify. It talks about she might stutter or, you 10 know, that kind of thing. I think that language would be good in this 11 12 particular case, Your Honor, to add, and I will note that the chapter in Sands does indicate that it can be appropriate to 13 14 add that language. 15 (Continued on next page.) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Proceedings 3218

1 (Continuing.)

MR. BINI: We will oppose and ask for the Sand instruction because, among other things, besides your Honor has always stressed the burden, there was actually a questionnaire regarding gender status. I think this issue has been really vetted and, in fact, there has not been any testimony relating to this topic during the course of the entire trial.

THE COURT: I'm going to adhere to the Sand charge.

And I will say this, Mr. Riopelle, this is my view on this: What I think is important here is for the jury not to think about this at all, to view this in only one fashion: That they have been ordered by the judge not to consider the fact that a defendant hasn't testified, not that I have to give them a reason.

MR. RIOPELLE: Okay.

THE COURT: That it is absolutely prohibited because I say so. And I've told them that twice already, first in the connection with the defense case and the sooner they think of nothing other than "put it out of my mind," I think it's better, frankly, for the defendant.

MR. RIOPELLE: Okay. Thank you, Judge.

That takes me to the next page which is the testimony of the defendant, if applicable, and it looks like that's not going to be applicable.

Proceedings

1 THE COURT: Still pending.

MR. RIOPELLE: We're not done yet.

THE COURT: That may change. So, it will be this one or that one or, in the odd situation where Mr. Discala testifies and Ms. Cane doesn't, both.

MR. BOWMAN: Your Honor, with respect to Page 70, the interest in the outcome of the case portion of the charge I object to.

There's no real reason to tell the jury that the defendant has an interest in the outcome of the case because, of course, everybody in the courtroom knows it. And by singling this out, you're saying that the defendant is the only person who has an interest in the outcome when nobody gives that kind of a charge to, for example, an FBI agent who has devoted weeks or months or years to an investigation.

So, I would object to the portion of the charge, and just omitting the words with an interest in the outcome of the case.

MR. BINI: Your Honor, if a defendant chooses to testify, the Government would ask for the standard charge that the defendant, of course, is the most interested of any witness and it's appropriate for the jury to consider.

THE COURT: If either defendant testifies, I'll give the standard charge.

MR. RIOPELLE: My next comment is on Page 76.

Case 1:	Tu-ci-nnaaa-Euly - nocriment opp - Elled Thyamis - Lade 5Tp of 543 Ladelin #: pnp4
	Proceedings 3220
1	THE COURT: Anything between 70 and 76? No.
2	MR. BINI: Not from the Government.
3	MR. RIOPELLE: Judge, on Page 76, I think we are
4	missing a verb. I think after the word "weight," which is
5	four lines up from the bottom of that paragraph, we need to
6	insert either "is" or "should."
7	The sentence reads: It is exclusively your duty,
8	based upon all the evidence and your own good judgment, to
9	determine whether the prior statement was inconsistent and, if
10	so, how much, if any, weight to be given to the inconsistent
11	statement in determining whether to believe all, part, or none
12	of the witness' testimony.
13	I think that sentence should read: And, if so, how
14	much, if any, weight is to be given.
15	Or: If so, how much, if any, weight should be
16	given.
17	I think there's a missing "to be" in that sentence.
18	THE COURT: Sounds like you're right.
19	MR. BINI: No objection to "should" be given.
20	MR. RIOPELLE: The Government prefers "should," so
21	we agree on "should."
22	THE COURT: You got that, Mr. Mejia?
23	THE LAW CLERK: Yes, sir.
24	MR. RIOPELLE: I have my notes if Mr. Mejia needs
25	them.

Proceedings 3221 1 THE COURT: After 76? 2 MR. RIOPELLE: I'm up to 81. 3 THE COURT: 81. 4 MR. RIOPELLE: Okay. I propose that we add a 5 sentence at the bottom of that charge. That is the charge about the use of conjunctive and disjunctive in the 6 7 indictment. I propose that the charge have a sentence added at 8 9 the bottom: However, I remind you that the defendants are on 10 trial only for committing the acts alleged in the indictment 11 and you may not consider evidence of any previous or similar 12 act as a substitute for proof that a defendant committed the 13 crimes charged in this case. We had a great deal of proof of prior and similar 14 15 acts, Judge, and it seems to me a good idea to focus the jury 16 on the fact that they need to focus on the evidence of the 17 crimes charged in this case rather than conduct that was 18 admitted as background. 19 MR. BINI: Your Honor, the Government would ask for 20 the standard conjunctive and disjunctive charge. And the 21 language here doesn't really relate to the proposed --22 THE COURT: And I think it's covered in other parts 23 of my charge. 24 MR. RIOPELLE: Okay. Thank you, Judge. My next

comment is on Page 100, so we're making progress.

Mr. Bini, do you have anything before Page 100?

MR. BINI: I do not.

MR. RIOPELLE: On Page 100, the Court cautions

MR. RIOPELLE: On Page 100, the Court cautions the jury that a defendant's mere presence at the scene of an alleged crime doesn't make the defendant guilty of being a member of the conspiracy.

This cautionary instruction is given in the midst of the conspiracy instruction. I would propose that rather than have the phrase "at the scene of the alleged crime" I would say "during an alleged conspiracy," so it would read as follows: I want to caution you, however, that a defendant's mere presence during an alleged conspiracy does not by itself make him or her a member of the conspiracy.

And then you could strike the first word of the next line, "similarly," and just go on to read: Mere association with one or more members of the conspiracy does not automatically make a defendant a member.

That is my proposal for page 100?

THE COURT: Anybody have a problem with that?

MR. BINI: Your Honor, the Government prefers the Sand instruction as given because the mere presence at the scene -- excuse me, "mere presence during a conspiracy" is different than the being at the scene of an alleged crime.

The Sand instruction, I think, classically is more of like the drug context or the robbery context, where there's

Proceedings

someone literally at the scene of the crime and you're in the wrong place at the wrong time sort of situation is what it envisions. However, if you change it to the defendant's mere presence during a conspiracy, well, conspiracy is for a long period of time, particularly as charged here. I think that's different and suggest that if a defendant, for example, keeps being involved in something, that that is not something the jury should consider and the Government thinks it's much the opposite.

So, we would ask for the mere presence at the scene of alleged crime does not by itself make him or her a member of the conspiracy, which is the standard instruction.

THE COURT: The change, I'm afraid, Mr. Riopelle, may create more confusion than is intended by you, first of all. And I don't particularly like the charge, but I don't particularly think the remedy makes it any better.

MR. RIOPELLE: Okay.

MR. BOWMAN: Your Honor, may Mr. Discala be excused?

THE COURT: Absolutely.

DEFENDANT DISCALA: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Please.

As long as they know they have a right to stay.

With no jury here, they can go.

MR. RIOPELLE: Okay. That takes me up to Page 101,

25 I believe.

case 1.	Proceedings 3224
1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	MR. RIOPELLE: I would like to add the phrase "if
3	you find unanimously that the" after the words "in sum," so
4	that the first line at the bottom paragraph reads: In sum, if
5	you find unanimously that the defendant had an understanding
6	of the unlawful character of the conspiracy, and then:
7	Intentionally engaged, advised, assisted in it or for the
8	purpose of furthering the illegal undertaking.
9	I would like to add the concept of unanimity there
10	in that phrase on 101.
11	THE COURT: Any objection from the Government?
12	MR. BINI: You want: In sum, if you find
13	unanimously defendant
14	MR. RIOPELLE: In sum, if you find unanimously that
15	a defendant, with
16	MR. BINI: And it goes on with the rest of the
17	charge?
18	MR. RIOPELLE: Yes.
19	MR. BINI: No objection, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: So be it.
21	MR. RIOPELLE: And then my next comment is on Page
22	102. I would like to add the following sentence to the end of
23	this charge: And I remind you that the burden remains on the
24	Government at all times to prove each and every element of the
25	crime charged beyond a reasonable doubt.

1	
THE COURT: You don't	think I say that enough?
2 MR. RIOPELLE: It can	never be said enough.
3 THE COURT: Moving ri	ght along, what's your next
4 one?	
5 MR. RIOPELLE: That c	ne is overruled. Okay.
6 My next one is on Pag	e 109. And I want to add the
7 word at the bottom of the parag	raph that ends "find the
8 defendant guilty," I want to ad	d the word "unanimously."
9 You see that line tha	t begins, Fact that all of you
10 find to be false in order to fi	nd the defendant guilty, I want
11 to add that they have to find i	t unanimously there.
So, I want that sente	nce to read as follows: There
must be at least one specific p	retense, representation, or
promise about a material fact t	hat all of you find unanimously
to be false in order to find a	defendant guilty.
16 THE COURT: That's ev	en a better "unanimously" than
17 the last one.	
MR. RIOPELLE: There	you go. A winner, I think.
19 THE COURT: Yes.	
MR. RIOPELLE: My nex	t objection appears on Page
21 114. I object to the conscious	avoidance language there that
appears in the paragraph beginn	ing: In determining whether a
defendant acted knowingly, et o	etera.
I don't believe this	is an appropriate case for a

conscious avoidance charge. I think that the Government's

theory is that my client was a wrongdoer and knew darn well what was going on. And the problem with the conscious avoidance charges is they dilute the burden of proof, and I don't think that the defendant has challenged the issue of knowledge in any great way in the case.

MR. BINI: Your Honor, the Government thinks that the Defendant Cane has challenged the issue of knowledge and Defendant Discala has as well from the opening statements.

Defendant Discala's opening statement was that he relied on all these people around him and that everybody betrayed him, in substance. And while Ms. Cane has both in her opening and during cross-examination presented the jury repeatedly that the use of this Ben-Bassat account was innocent, that she just did selling from that account, and that she did not participate deliberately in the fraud scheme, the Government has presented evidence, including call after call where Discala is informing her of what he's doing and there's also text messages from other co-conspirators.

So, the Government believes that Defendant Cane and Defendant Discala both have claimed to not be aware of the pump and dump that was happening right around them. And for this reason, we think that this instruction is appropriate.

In looking at the case law, I was looking at *United*States v. Ebbers, 458 F. 3rd 110, Second Circuit decision from 2010, where the Second Circuit affirmed giving the conscious

RPR

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

avoidance/willful blindness instruction with respect to Bernie Ebbers, where he had indicated that he signed 10-Ks and -Qs and just didn't look at them. I think similarly here we have testimony and evidence that suggests that Cane had to know based on the use of the Ben-Bassat account, and, so, she was closing her eyes between the Ben-Bassat account and the other evidence to the fraud scheme. THE COURT: I think a conscious avoidance charge is warranted on the evidence and the argument and I'm going to overrule the objection. MR. RIOPELLE: Thank you, your Honor. I'm now up to Page 116 of the charge. THE COURT: 116. Okay. MR. RIOPELLE: I would like to add the following language after the phrase "caused by him and her," which is in about the middle of the page where a paragraph ends. I would change the period to a comma and add the If you find the proof establishes beyond a reasonable doubt that such actions were taken or such representations were made with an intent to defraud.

MR. BINI: Your Honor, the Government would ask for the standard instruction because, among other things, this would add practically another sentence to this. This is kind of the no alternate harm instruction and the Government would

25 ask for the standard instruction.

RPR

3228

1 THE COURT: I'm going to adhere to the Sand standard 2 instruction. 3 MR. RIOPELLE: That takes me to Page 132, your 4 Honor. There again, the Court has included a reference to 5 conscious avoidance. I have objected to that inclusion, and I just make my objection again for the purposes of the record. 6 7 THE COURT: Absolutely. 8 MR. RIOPELLE: That takes me to Page 134, where, 9 again, there is the same phrase "representations caused by him 10 or her, " and I have requested and do request that the same 11 phrase we just discussed be included. 12 I have the sense that Mr. Bini objects --13 MR. BINI: Yes. MR. RIOPELLE: -- and I know how that comes out. 14 15 THE COURT: Same objection, same ruling. 16 MR. RIOPELLE: Right. Okay. 17 That takes me to Page 158, Judge. 18 THE COURT: 158, you said? 19 MR. RIOPELLE: 158, yes, sir. 20 At 158, at the end of this charge, there is the 21 following sentence: Each specific use of a telephone or the 22 mail in furtherance of the scheme to defraud constitutes a 23 separate and distinct criminal offense. 24 That's in connection with the conspiracy charge, and 25 I don't think this instruction needs to be given in connection

Case 1:	14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 225 of 243 PageID #: 6063
	Proceedings 3229
1	with a conspiracy charge. There are separate and distinct
2	mailings and wires that are charged as such for crimes and the
3	Court will instruct the jury as to those. But I think saying
4	every time you use a telephone, that's a crime too in the
5	context of the conspiracy charge is unfair to the defendant.
6	MR. BINI: I think your Honor made that change
7	because I don't see it on 158 of 601.
8	MR. RIOPELLE: Maybe he didn't make that change.
9	MR. BINI: You won already.
10	MR. RIOPELLE: Now I'm giving the Court a chance
11	MR. BINI: Take it back, Judge.
12	MR. RIOPELLE: Sorry, I'm not reading my own notes
13	well at 6:30 at night.
14	MR. BINI: The Government requests a change to Page
15	163.
16	MR. RIOPELLE: I'm at 159.
17	MR. BINI: I'm sorry.
18	MR. RIOPELLE: I'd like to add the language at the
19	bottom
20	THE COURT: What page are we on, gentlemen?
21	MR. RIOPELLE: 159. That last sentence on 159, it
22	says: Second, that a defendant knowingly and intentionally
23	became a member of the conspiracy.

I would like to amend that sentence to read: Second, that the Defendant whom you are considering knowingly

24

Case 1:	<u> 14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 226 of 243 PageID #: 6064</u>
	Proceedings 3230
1	and intentionally became a member of the conspiracy.
2	Emphasizing the individuality of guilt as to each
3	defendant.
4	MR. BINI: No objection, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Yes, you got that one.
6	MR. RIOPELLE: Fantastic.
7	And on 163, Mr. Bini?
8	MR. BINI: Yes.
9	On 163, Overt Act D, the Government did not present
10	evidence regarding Overt Act D, so the Government would ask
11	that that be removed.
12	THE COURT: No objection?
13	MR. BINI: That's on or about October 17, 2013,
14	Ofsink caused an e-mail to be sent to Shapiro, which e-mail
15	attached a sham consulting agreement. And it goes on.
16	THE COURT: All accord in deletion?
17	MR. BOWMAN: Yes.
18	MR. RIOPELLE: No objection.
19	THE COURT: Make sure that Ben has that, Mr. Bini.
20	MR. RIOPELLE: I can give him my copy. Thank you,
21	Ben.
22	Judge, I'm pleased to report I have no further
23	comments on the charge.
24	THE COURT: How about you, Mr. Bini?
25	MR. BINI: Your Honor, I was just pulling up

Case 1:	14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 227 of 243 PageID #: 6065
	Proceedings 3231
1	Ms. Jones had a redacted indictment I know you're not
2	sending it back, but where we had proposed changing some of
3	the names that are set out in the indictment. I just want to
4	pull that up, if I could, because it affects the overt acts.
5	THE COURT: Okay. You want to delete them?
6	MR. BINI: Well, we've presented evidence on the
7	rest other than D, which we asked to remove. But with respect
8	to some of the individuals named, some of the
9	co-conspirators give me one moment. Ms. Jones is just
10	zooming ahead to the portion of the indictment where we put in
11	the names.
12	THE COURT: Oh, the days of black felt marker, how
13	to make it appear and disappear in the ether.
14	MR. BINI: So, on Overt Act F, the Government would
15	ask to take out "Co-conspirator 2" and put in instead "Victor
16	Azrak."
17	THE COURT: Any objection?
18	MR. ROSS: No objection.
19	MR. RIOPELLE: No objection, Judge.
20	MR. BINI: It appears twice on Overt Act F, and I'll
21	give my hand-changed to Mr. Mejia after.
22	Then on Paragraph G, the Government would ask that

MR. ROSS: No objection.

"Co-conspirator 3" be changed to "Marc Wexler."

23

24

25

THE COURT: I assume again no objection.

Proceedings 3232 1 MR. RIOPELLE: No objection, Judge. 2 MR. BINI: Paragraph I, the Government would ask to 3 change "Co-conspirator 2" to "Victor Azrak." 4 MR. ROSS: No objection. 5 MR. RIOPELLE: No objection. MR. BINI: In Paragraph N, the Government would ask 6 7 to change "Co-conspirator 3" to "Marc Wexler." 8 MR. ROSS: No objection. 9 MR. RIOPELLE: No objection. MR. BINI: The Government would ask to insert the 10 11 aiding and abetting instruction wherever your Honor think it 12 appropriate. Perhaps it would be after the first substantive count, securities fraud, Count Three, which ends on Page 184. 13 14 THE COURT: Any objection? 15 MR. ROSS: No objection. 16 MR. RIOPELLE: No objection. 17 THE COURT: We'll add it there. 18 MR. BINI: And then the other objection, the request 19 to change the jury charge the Government has, begin on Page 20 199, where, again, we would just like to fill in with respect 21 to the counts the names of the individuals as the evidence has 22 come in. 23 On Page 199, Count Six indicates telephone call from 24 Discala to Broker 1. The Government would request to put in

the name "Jamie Sloan" instead of "Broker 1."

MR. BINI: In addition, with respect to that call, the Government put in the evidence — the excerpt the Government included did not include reference to CodeSmart or StarStream, so the Government would ask to change that to

24

_			
$^{\circ}$	$r \cap c \cap$	~ 0.1	$n \propto c$
	roce	$-\alpha$. II U S

state: Telephone call from Discala to Marc Wexler discussing, among other things, the manipulation of Cubed stock.

MR. ROSS: No objection.

MR. RIOPELLE: No objection.

MR. BINI: That's it from the Government.

The Government had one issue with respect to the verdict sheet.

THE COURT: Let's finish the charge and then we'll go with the verdict.

MR. BINI: Sure.

MR. SHROYER: We do have something to raise, your Honor.

On Page 206 at the end of the good faith charge is where we would insert a reliance on counsel charge. We've provided the language of that charge to the Court previously in a letter. It's hard for me to remember if it was earlier this week or last week.

THE COURT: And we have it.

MR. SHROYER: This is where we think it would be appropriate. We think that the evidence demonstrates with all the various accusations about actions that were taken, about understanding of the security law, that it's appropriate here for Mr. Discala to have that charge, particularly given that we're not sure yet exactly how the Government is going to be spinning all these different background acts and 403(b) acts,

et cetera.

MS. JONES: Your Honor, we had briefed this issue earlier and it's abundantly clear that the defendant has not met any of the prerequisites to get that charge. It's not even clear what attorney he's talking about, what information was applied to that attorney, what advice was given to that attorney — from that attorney and whether or not in Mr. Discala actually followed that advice. So, there's clearly no basis for this charge.

MR. SHROYER: I would disagree with that characterization of the evidence, your Honor.

There has been evidence that Mr. Discala suffered losses in some of the -- in particular, during certain time frames on all of the three securities that were traded prior to Cubed, that he sought advice about the construction of the escrow accounts, that some of the various text messages and phone calls demonstrate that he expressed thoughts and feelings about the way the escrows were being carried out. And there's no question based on the evidence that that arrangement was devised by an attorney who was an expert in the securities field.

THE COURT: There's clearly no evidence that warrants the charge up to now. So, unless you have another witness that you haven't told us about yet, there's no basis for it.

		Proceedings				3236		
	MR.	SHROYER:	We've	disclosed	our	witnesses	at	this
point.								

THE COURT: Then there is no basis in the evidence for that charge $\ensuremath{\mathsf{--}}$

MR. SHROYER: Thank you.

1.3

THE COURT: -- given the applicable case law. So, I will not charge it on the basis of the evidence that's been adduced so far.

MR. SHROYER: The other point that I would want to make about that is that it is our belief, based on the case law, that it's not the same analysis as the attorney-client privilege analysis, whereby there needs to be a personal attorney-client relationship that's established; that this defense, this attack, on the intent element, as opposed to it being an affirmative defense, simply requires good faith based on representations that are made.

And, so, we do think that the argument that -- I think Ms. Jones was alluding to a higher standard that's necessary than the case law allows for, so I'd like to make that clear as well.

THE COURT: Our analysis of the case law applied to the facts that I've listened to. There's no basis for that charge.

 $\mbox{MR. SHROYER:} \mbox{ Understood. Thank you, your Honor.}$

THE COURT: Anything else on the charge?

Case 1:14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 233 of 243 PageID #: 6071 Proceedings 3237 1 MR. BINI: Not on the charge. 2 THE COURT: Okay. That's Court Exhibit 1. Now 3 we'll address Court Exhibit 1-A, which is the verdict sheet. 4 (Court Exhibit 1 and 1-A, were received in 5 evidence.) 6 MR. RIOPELLE: Yes, Judge. For Ms. Cane, I just 7 noticed and note that the only issue is that there appears to 8 be some sort of word processing glitching on, How do you find a particular defendant, it then says not guilty and the guilty 9 10 is sort of under. We just need to straighten that out so it's 11 on one line. 12 THE COURT: Yes, it will be on one line. 13 MR. RIOPELLE: I notice it's kind of glitchy there. I'm sure Mr. Mejia will know how to fix that up. 14 15 Other than that, Ms. Cane does not have any comments 16 on the verdict sheet. 17 MR. BINI: Your Honor? 18 THE COURT: Mr. Bini? 19 MR. BINI: We had one request, which is that with 20 respect to the overt acts, there's sort of a special jury 21 instruction here, and I apologize because I should have 22 submitted a proposed verdict sheet. I know --

MR. BINI: We did not.

We couldn't find any.

23

24

25

did.

THE COURT: You allegedly did. Everybody allegedly

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings

3238

I know when I was part of the trial team before your Honor in October/November 2015, the verdict sheet we proposed included such a special verdict format as to which specific overt acts were found in United States v. Kirschner, et al. However, since that time, I know in our unit, in revisiting this and looking at the 371 charge, we have requested to just have the guilty or not guilty because the charge itself, the 371, the charge regarding the 18 U.S.C. 371 charge, makes clear that the jury must unanimously find one overt act. So, the Government believes that is sufficient and that the special verdict sheet is not required. I would note that since I had the opportunity to try that case before your Honor in at least two other trials I'm aware of in the district; in United States v. Petrossi, 16-CR-234 before Judge Cogan, and I know in the Shkreli and I believe in *Greebel*, I believe that was 371 charge as well, in both of those trials before Judge Matsumoto the verdict sheets did not have the specific overt acts. So, we would request it without the overt acts if your Honor agrees. MR. RIOPELLE: I like it with the overt acts. THE COURT: They come from you ultimately, Mr. Bini. MR. BINI: That's true, your Honor, and we bear the burden.

OCR

Case 1.	Proceedings	3239
1	(Continued on next page.)	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Case 1:14-cr-00399-ENV Document 665 Filed 10/20/18 Page 236 of 243 PageID #: 607 Proceedings 3240 1 (Continuing.) 2 THE COURT: They need to find one to convict, so 3 I'll leave it in. 4 MR. ROSS: We have no November other comments on the 5 verdict sheet. 6 THE COURT: Okay, good. So night court is almost 7 over. 8 MS. JONES: Your Honor --9 THE COURT: Maybe not. 10 MS. JONES: There are two brief issues that I'd like 11 to raise with you regarding the current witnesses on the 12 stand, Ms. Eckhart. My understanding was that she was going 1.3 to testify along similar lines like the Government's witness 14 Joan Mazella, that she reviewed certain bank records, she 15 reviewed certain brokerage records, and based on her review 16 and analysis she prepared reports that summarized those 17 records, that that is what she was going to testify about. 18 Assuming that we're talking about the charged stocks 19 in this case, that's fine. However, based on the questioning 20 to date in which Ms. Eckhart has stated that she's been 21 qualified as an expert in forensic accounting over 34 times, I 22 want to be clear that we are not okay with qualifying this 23 person as an expert. There has been no expert notification

provided to the Government. There has been no summary of her

opinions or any of that. So to the extent that there is

24

1.3

Proceedings

intending to be testimony of a forensic accounting expert nature that goes beyond her review of just summarizing the bank records and brokerage records, we're going to object.

And I just want to make that clear.

THE COURT: I thought it was clear. It's that line that, I frankly considered what -- she's not an agent -- what Ms. Mazella did, that's in the nature of specialized knowledge, so it's in that middle field. And we don't declare them expert witnesses, but we allow that specialized knowledge in. I assumed that's what we would hear from Ms. Eckhart as well.

MS. JONES: That's fine. The second issue, is that I want tomorrow to go quickly and smoothly so we can move on and get to closings as quickly as possible. I don't want there to be back and forth or delay, but I do want to make it clear that it's the burden of the defense counsel to lay the foundation for these charts and make sure that the charts are based on admitted evidence.

Defense counsel has asked me twice if I would just, if the Government is prepared to stipulate that the binders of 4,500 pages that they gave me as the underlying analysis if I wanted to stipulate that that's admissible. I'm not going to do that. I do not have the time to sit down and match up what is an admitted Government's Exhibit and what is not; what is a business record and what is not.

3242

1 To the extent that there are discreet, specific 2 documents that they want admit as business records and we can 3 agree that they are authentic, that's fine. But the burden 4 should be on the defense counsel to lay the foundation based 5 on admitted exhibits that have been produced to date. We have 6 a business records certification and we've moved into evidence 7 all the bank records we have for Discala, all the brokerage records that we have for Discala. 8 9 I asked Mr. Cheng, are these brokerage and bank statements the same as what has been admitted into evidence 10 11 and he said he wasn't sure, he didn't know. The burden should 12 be on them, not me, to figure that out. 1.3 THE COURT: I agree. 14 MR. ROSS: Judge, Mr. Cheng is not here. 15 understand what the Government is saying and --16 THE COURT: They have to be within, rooted in the 17 evidence. 18 MR. ROSS: We understand, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Eckhart has got to be 20 prepared to say that. 21 MR. HEIN: I just wanted to raise a logistical 22 matter for tomorrow. Obviously, we don't know how long this 23 witness will last or whether the Government will put on a 24 rebuttal case. But assuming the witness lasts an hour, 25 hour-and-a-half, around noon, the Government estimates our

Proceedings 3243 1 closing is probably around three hours. If we were able to 2 break for lunch earlier than we normally do, perhaps at noon, 3 and reconvene at one to commence. I think that would probably 4 be best, at least for the Government timing wise. I wanted to 5 mention that to your Honor. 6 I also wanted to mention to, your Honor, that given 7 we estimate it will be three hours, to see if we can take a 8 short break about halfway through, just a bathroom break. 9 THE COURT: Yes, I don't have a problem with that 10 either. 11 MR. RIOPELLE: Your Honor, Roland Riopelle for the 12 defendant Kyleen Cane. What is the Court's practice with 13 respect to the defense closings? Do we go from the bottom of 14 the caption up, or top of the caption down? 15 THE COURT: Here is normally what I do, allow the 16 defendants to decide first among themselves as to who is going 17 to go first. If there is a disagreement strategy-wise, then I 18 usually take the first named defendant first. 19 MR. ROSS: That's fine, Judge. 20 THE COURT: Just the way, Mr. Riopelle, you went 21 first on with your case. That was on agreement. It's not a 22 problem.

MR. RIOPELLE: Okay.

23

24

25

THE COURT: If you guys agree, that's fine. If not, it will be Mr. Discala who will go first.

Proceedings

1 With respect to defense, so we can time it out, with 2 respect to defense closings do we have any estimates? 3 Judge, my estimate would be an MR. ROSS: 4 hour-and-a-half perhaps two. 5 MR. RIOPELLE: I think mine will be similar in 6 length, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. The Government is to be also on 8 notice for their rebuttal close, it has to be linked to the 9 something that one of the these guys said. We are not going to have another round two of round one. 10 11 MS. JONES: Okay, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: So it's plain to me. 1.3 MR. RIOPELLE: I would like to ask a question in 14 that regard. Are there tape recordings that have been 15 admitted in evidence that have not been played during the 16 trial? 17 MS. JONES: I don't think so. I think our intent 18 was to only admit the items that we wished to play. 19 MR. RIOPELLE: The reason I ask, your Honor, is with 20 my failing memory I recall the sting of the ones played during 21 the trial but I don't -- there were so many marked as 22 exhibits, I don't recall all of them. And every lawyer's 23 worse nightmare is to stand up and sum up based on what they 24 heard in the courtroom and then have something flying from out 25 of space that we haven't really dealt with in the courtroom.

And I don't want to be, I'm not accusing the Government of doing anything wrong, I don't want to be sandbagged.

1.3

THE COURT: I think in that regard you worked fairly well amongst all of you.

MR. RIOPELLE: As the Court saw today, I don't remember all that was admitted.

THE COURT: That's why we have Henry.

MR. RIOPELLE: And he's not here.

THE COURT: We're in trouble. We'll do the best we can.

MS. JONES: Your Honor, I think we played everything all the calls. I think we played all the calls we admitted into evidence. That was the intent, to only move into evidence things that we actually intended to play.

MR. RIOPELLE: Okay. That may be right, I just want to make sure that if I sum up -- I've got the notebooks that the Government gave me with the calls that were played. And I want to make sure that that's what I should focus on tonight as I gather my thoughts. I just don't want to have something come out of the blue tomorrow that I haven't anticipated; although, that will certainly happen regardless.

THE COURT: I'm just trying to think in my own mind how -- timing, it should work. We'll keep refining it as we go. That sounds like an operational plan, as Mr. Hein commented, about the length and codicils from the defense. I

- 1 think it works.
- 2 MR. HEIN: Thank you, your Honor.
- 3 MR. BINI: Your Honor, other thing that I should
- 4 have mentioned with respect to the verdict sheet is that I
- 5 | would ask for the same changes, the overt acts, that I asked
- 6 in the overt acts as in the instructions. So I'll give those
- 7 to -- I'll show them to defense counsel.
- 8 THE COURT: That will be good.
- 9 MR. RIOPELLE: As long as none of the names filled
- 10 in are Kyleen Cane, I'm good with that, Judge.
- 11 THE COURT: Anything you say. Anything else before
- 12 | we end night court?
- MS. JONES: Not for the Government.
- 14 MR. ROSS: Not for Mr. Discala.
- MS. JONES: One thing, Mr. Discala did promise
- 16 copies of the redacted exhibits that they want to use
- 17 tomorrow. So hopefully I will get copies of those within the
- 18 next hour or so.
- 19 THE COURT: That's what I understood from Mr. Cheng
- 20 when you talked about it at lunch time.
- 21 MS. JONES: I haven't received them yet.
- THE COURT: Hopefully he's not here right now
- 23 because that's exactly what he and the witness are doing.
- 24 We'll see you all in the morning.
- MS. JONES: Thank you.

Case 1:	14-cr-00399-ENV Document	665 Filed 10/20/18	Page 243 of 243 P	ageID #: 6081
				3247
1	MR. ROSS:	Thank you.		
2	MR. RIOPELL	E: Thank you,	your Honor.	
3	(Proceeding	s adjourned at	7:10 p.m. to res	sume on
4	May 1, 2018 at 9:45 a	.m.)		
5		INDEX		
6	WITNESS		PAGE	
7	CONSTANTINE VOULGARIS			
8	DIRECT EXAMINATION CROSS-EXAMINATION	BY MR. BOWMAN	3017	
9	CROSS-EXAMINATION REDIRECT EXAMINATION	BY MR. BINI	3123	
10	RECROSS-EXAMINATION RECROSS-EXAMINATION			
11	DAVID BAKER			
12	DIRECT EXAMINATION			
13	CROSS-EXAMINATION	BY MR. HEIN	3152	
14	DAVID PARKER			
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION CROSS-EXAMINATION			
16	ERIC ENGSTROM			
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION			
18	CROSS-EXAMINATION	BY MS. JONES	3183	
19	HALEY ECKHART			
20	DIRECT EXAMINATION	BY MR. CHENG	3192	
21		EXHIBI	I S	
22	DEFENDANT KC-ST-1	PAGE 3146		
23	3500-DP-3	3160		
24	COURT 1 and 1-A	PAGE 3237		
25		020 /		